

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 940 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Upgrade Water and Wastewater System at Diablo East | | |
| Project No: 060160 | Unit/Facility Name: Amistad National Recreation Area | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: 23 | State: TX |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---------|
| FCI-Before: 0.50 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 28 |
| Project Description: This project will rehabilitate the water distribution and wastewater collection piping system and the water booster pump system; construct three new lift stations, a new well, security fencing for the potable water system, and a new fish cleaning station; coat and seal the concrete water reservoir; and replace the water system valves and vaults. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The water and wastewater systems servicing these facilities are 25 to 30 years old. The wastewater system consists of gravity sewer collection mains, three lift stations with separate wet wells and mechanical rooms and pressure sewer mains. Any maintenance performed on the mechanical equipment requires a Confined Space Entry permit. Mechanical vaults are approximately 24 feet deep and they do not have required fall protection, adequate ventilation or properly sized man-ways for ingress and egress. The need to conduct frequent repairs on these lift stations is an unnecessary risk to employee safety. The systems have to be monitored constantly due to them not operating properly. If the systems are not monitored and pumped on schedule, wastewater will over flow in the surrounding area and will contaminate surface and ground water with raw sewage. The system is located uphill from Lake Amistad and could contaminate drinking water and swim areas, making them unsafe. If the wastewater collection system fails the result would be no sanitary facilities at the most popular area of the park. | | |
| The water system is unreliable and is often out of service. The original system was not designed for the current needs of the park. The pressure tanks and booster pumps provide distribution pressure for the water system. These pumps and motors and associated electrical controls are no longer cost effective to repair. Seven of the thirteen control valves are seized and will not operate. Failure to make extensive repairs will result in a continued loss of drinking water and low pressure events. A lack of drinking water at this location would adversely affect visitor and employee health. | | |
| Currently the facilities have to be closed to the visitors without prior notice until temporary repairs or pumping can be completed. In the past year the comfort stations have been shut down 5 times while repairs were made to the lift stations. The fish cleaning station has been closed 17 times due to electrical, plumbing failures or fish hooks locking up the grinder pump. If this project is not completed, the systems will eventually shut down permanently or until repairs can be made. Due to the age and condition of the potable and wastewater system, concern for the safety and welfare of the park visitors has been expressed by park maintenance personnel. The system is located just uphill from the lake and with the lack of top soil, the limestone in the area will carry any spills directly to the lake. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 10 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 940 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 1,003,000 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 0 Total Component Estimate: \$ 1,003,000 100 Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 1,003,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 1,003,000 |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 1/2006 Project Complete: 4/2006 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/21/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 86,000 | Projected: \$ 32,000 | Net Change: \$ (54,000) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 775 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Otter Creek Bridge and Campground Services | | |
| Project No: 066249 | Unit/Facility Name: Blue Ridge Parkway | |
| Region: Southeast | Congressional District: 06 | State: VA |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| FCI-Before: 1.02 | FCI-Projected: 0.45 | API: 23 |
| Project Description: This funding will be used to replace the existing Otter Creek Bridge that provides access to a major Blue Ridge Parkway campground known as Otter Creek. The project also includes the relocation of the campground kiosk, reconstruction of a stone retaining wall, and relocation of sewer, electric and water lines for the concession-operated restaurant facility. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Otter Creek campground has 68 campsites and is used by thousands of visitors throughout the year. It is one of two campgrounds, and the only one in Virginia, that remain open for winter visitors. This existing bridge was installed when the campground was originally constructed. The bottom of the bridge deck is approximately 4' above the creek bed. Three to four times per year, a rainfall event occurs that is significant enough to cause flooding in the area. Once the flooding starts, debris is washed downstream. Because of the design of the existing bridge, the debris is trapped under the bridge, creating a "dam". This "dam" causes the water to backup and spill over the bridge, piling debris up against the bridges guardrails. The water then is diverted around the end of the bridge, causing the floodwaters to leave the natural channel. This has resulted in significant erosion that is threatening a concession facility. Damage has occurred to the outdoor patio area used by the concessionaire as an outdoor dining area. This damage has been significant enough that the patio area is scheduled for removal in FY2001 as the erosion has undermined the area to a point that it is extremely unsafe. Until this bridge is raised it is not economically feasible to continue to repair this patio. Although no floodwaters have actually damaged the concession building itself, documentation shows that the water has reached the structure. Floodwaters have reached the campground entrance station/kiosk and have caused damage including saturation of the carpeting and interior woodwork. The diverted floodwaters also spill into a sanitary sewer manhole, flooding the sewage treatment system causing untreated wastewater to be released into Otter Creek. This is a direct threat to public health and severely impacts these trout waters and other wildlife habitat. The bridge is the only means of ingress and egress for the campground. Whenever a rainfall event is significant enough to present a threat of flooding, all visitors are required to leave the Otter Creek campground before the bridge is flooded. Flooding threatens the life of anyone not made to evacuate and any property that is left behind. Prior to the policy of requiring evacuation, a visitor was allowed to remain in the campground. This visitor experienced life threatening medical problems and required transport to a medical facility. The flooded bridge required that this person be hand carried, by a lifesaving crew, for approximately one-mile along a power line right-of-way. The campground was not flooded at the time, only the bridge. Raising this bridge out of this creek's natural channel will eliminate the need to evacuate the campground due to floodwaters. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. 50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 25 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X | | Total Project Score: 775 |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|--|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 804,000 % 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 % 0 Total Component Estimate: \$ 804,000 % 100 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 804,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 804,000 |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 1/2006 Project Complete: 4/2006 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 43,000 | Projected: \$ 41,000 | Net Change: \$ (2,000) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 340 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|
| Project Title: Construct Floating Docks to Provide Safe Access to Little Brewster Island | | |
| Project No: 016328 | Unit/Facility Name: Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 07,08,09,10 | State: Massachusetts |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|--|---|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.00 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 27 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will allow safe access to Little Brewster Island for visitors. The current facility is comprised of a fixed granite block wharf with a fendering system and ladder leading to the water. Due to a tide range of approximately 10 feet, visitors accessing the island by boat must climb up a steel ladder of approximately 20 feet to gain access to a wharf and the island. This limits the number of visitors to the island, the time of day that access can be gained (due to the tidal fluctuations) and the ability to allow access by handicapped persons. This project will eliminate these hardships by constructing a fixed pile support system adjacent to the wharf and installing a floating pier, a lifting platform, and winches for vessels to moor and off-load passengers. A ramped personnel gangway, a power-assisted handicapped gangway, and raised platform will be installed from the floating dock system to the wharf for visitors to transit from the floating docks to the top of the wharf. A raised platform will be installed on the existing South Pier to keep the top of the gangway out of the water.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: Little Brewster Island is home to Boston Light, site of the first lighthouse constructed in America (1716). The island lies at the entrance to Boston Harbor and is only accessible by boat. The approximately one acre island contains the existing lighthouse, constructed in 1783 (the former light was burned down by the British as they evacuated Boston during the Revolutionary War), keepers quarters constructed in 1884, oil house, cistern building and boathouse. Boston Light is a National Historic Landmark, and Little Brewster Island is listed on the on the National Register of Historic Places. With the creation of the Boston Harbor Islands National Recreation Area, Little Brewster Island and the facilities on the island will be available for public visitation and cultural interpretation. The site offers a wealth of historic significance in several areas including development of lighthouse technology, early colonial transportation and the development of Boston as a major seaport. Existing access to the island is unacceptable for safe transit and off loading/on loading of visitors. Improvements to allow more visitors to the island will create a much-improved Park and allow more in-depth enjoyment of the history associated with the harbor islands.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>70 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 70 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 70 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 340</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----|---------|------------------------|---------|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | | | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ | 0 | 0 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 | | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ | 832,000 | 100 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 832,000 | | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | | | \$ | 832,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 | | | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | | | Project Total: | | | | \$ | 832,000 | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | | Unchanged Since | | |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 1 / 2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | | Departmental | | |
| Project Complete: | | | 4 / 2006 | | | 1/19/2005 | | | Approval: YES: NO: x | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Current: \$ 0 | Projected: \$ 200 | Net Change: \$ 200 |
|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 542 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Building 5 | | |
| Project No: 016285 | Unit/Facility Name: Boston National Historical Park | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 08 | State: MA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.41 | | FCI-Projected: 0.24 | | API: 34 | |
| Project Description: Building 5, built between 1813 and 1816 as a three-story brick supply building in the Charlestown Navy Yard, shares a common wall with Building 4 and functions as one structure with a total of 39,000 square feet of usable space. The buildings will receive exterior preservation treatment and the first floor space will be rehabilitated for a visitor center at the Charlestown Navy Yard. Exterior work required includes exterior masonry repointing, painting, and repair/replacement of selected wood windows. The rehabilitation of the interior will make the first floor accessible; upgrade the HVAC electrical, plumbing and fire alarm systems; and create a new visitor center with typical NPS services including restrooms, visitor contact and sales, interpretive media, and multi-purpose AV room. | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The existing Charlestown Navy Yard Visitor Center is in a leased space under a “tenancy-at-will” agreement with the U.S. Navy. The lease will be terminated within the next three years leaving the park with no visitor center for the 1.5 visitors to the navy yard. This project will move the existing Visitor Center from leased space to Building 5, one of the oldest and most prominent structures in the Charlestown Navy Yard, located directly in front of the USS Constitution. The park hosts over 500 special events, meetings and functions, serving more than 68,000 people. Consistent with the park’s GMP, Building 5 is the ideal location for the visitor center given the prominent location of the building and the proximity to the USS Constitution. This project will consolidate three visitor facilities into one, providing substantial operating efficiency for the park. Crewmembers assigned to the USS Constitution are housed on the third floor of Building 5. The enabling legislation for Boston NHP requires that NPS support the needs of the US Navy in their operation of the USS Constitution. This building is the only navy yard structure that meets this need given the space requirements and its immediate proximity to the historic ship. This project will upgrade an historic structure from fair to good condition. | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | | | | |
| 20 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred | | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | | 5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | |
| 42 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | | 33 % Other Capital Improvement | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: | | NO: x | | Total Project Score: 542 | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|----------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 2,065,000 | 67 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 1,017,000 | 33 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 3,082,000 |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$ 3,082,000 | 100 | Planned Funding: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: A | | | Future Funding to | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | Complete Project: | | |
| | | | \$ 0 | | |
| | | | Project Total: | | |
| | | | \$ 3,082,000 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award 1 / 2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental |
| Project Complete: 4 / 2007 | | | 1/19/2005 | | Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 182,527 | Projected: \$ 131,355 | Net Change: (\$ 51,172) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 650 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace & Upgrade Curation Facilities in Partnership with University of New Mexico | | |
| Project No: 039584 | Unit/Facility Name: Chaco Culture National Historical Park | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: 03 | State: NM |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: NA (not an NPS asset) | FCI-Projected: NA | API: NA | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will reimburse the University of New Mexico (UNM) for the NPS share of the construction costs of a new curation and research facility and fund the tenant improvements for the NPS occupied space in the new facility. The NPS and UNM have a partnership that dates back to the 1930s when UNM conducted field schools in Chaco Canyon. Together, NPS and UNM curate the largest, most comprehensive, and best-documented research collection from Chaco Culture NHP, a UNESCO World Heritage Site. UNESCO recognizes natural and cultural sites of world-wide importance held in trust for all mankind. Since 1990, the park and UNM have collaborated in the planning of a facility for collections storage and research to meet the standards set in 39 CFR 79. This facility will house NPS collections from the park and from other interested New Mexico Anasazi park units.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The need for this project is to professionally and appropriately curate, preserve, and make available for study, interpretation, and public exhibition the diverse archaeological collections from the Southwest. Through on-going Cooperative Agreements, the NPS and UNM archaeological and archival research collections from prehistoric Anasazi sites are stored in five Maxwell Museum of Anthropology (MMA) locations on the UNM campus. The 5 million+ artifacts in the park and Maxwell Museum of Anthropology (MMA) museum collections are stored in 5 separate buildings, including an unremodeled 2-bay car wash. UNM and the park are not in compliance with legal mandates for curating federal collections. 36 CFR 79 states that a federal collection should be stored in a single repository; should be in a dedicated facility for storage, study, and conservation; and should be stored under physically secure and environmentally protected conditions. Current storage of federal collections on the UNM campus meets none of these standards. None have environmental or climatic controls; fire detection and suppression systems; dedicated access; integrated security systems; or adequate space for storage, processing, work or research. A joint NPS-UNM facility is the most cost-effective means to responsibly conserve and preserve the Chaco collections. This facility will completely eliminate all threats to the collection, with state-of-the art, zoned environmental controls, security, and fire detection systems, and will accommodate the current collection as well as anticipated growth for the next 25 years. The facility will provide park managers and researchers access to comprehensive Chaco Canyon artifact, archival, and data collections in a single location, increasing efficiency in resource management and promoting research.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>50 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>50 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 50 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 50 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X | | Total Project Score: 650 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | \$ 2,119,000 | 50 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | \$ 2,119,000 | 50 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 4,238,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | | \$ 4,238,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 |
| Class of Estimate: | | B | | Project Total: | \$ 4,238,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | | 09/30/06 | | | |
| Dates: | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | | 2/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental |
| Project Complete: | | 1/2007 | | 1/20/2005 | Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 0 (Partner) | Projected: \$ 0 (Partner) | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|

National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 559 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------|
| Project Title: Repair/Rehabilitate Great Falls Visitor Center and Facilities | | |
| Project No: 014930 | Unit Name: Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park | |
| Region: National Capital | Congressional District: 08 | State: Maryland |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--|---------------------|---------|
| FCI-Before: 0.07 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 28 |
| Project Description: This project will rehabilitate facilities to ensure structure meets ADA requirements for employees and visitors. Upgrade HVAC system to address severe moisture problems that are leading to major destruction of significant cultural resources. Upgrade electrical system to eliminate identified electrical system hazards and electrical code violations. Complete essential preservation maintenance on structure to correct damage caused by excessive moisture problems and eliminates safety and health violations and concerns. Flood proof first floor visitor use areas with sustainable methods and relocate and upgrade visitor restroom facilities by constructing a new comfort station. Restore surrounding landscape to evoke historical perspective. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The Great Falls Tavern area is the most visited site in the park with 1.2 million visitors annually. The structure retains most of its historic fabric and character which provides an excellent opportunity to provide educational and interpretive programs on canal life and canal boat operations in a compact setting. Ninety percent of existing rehabilitation conditions in the structure is related to water/moisture problems. If the problems are not corrected, the historical resources will continue to degrade and will ultimately be lost. Water/moisture damage and the potential for health and safety matters associated with mold, exposure to lead paint peelings, and excessive moisture will escalate. The existing comfort station is functionally obsolete and needs to be replaced with an accessible new facility. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 17 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred 8 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| 14 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 25 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 11 % Other Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 559 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 1,496,100 81 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 350,900 19 Total Project Estimate: \$ 1,847,000 100 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 1,847,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 1,847,000 |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 1 / 2006 Project Complete: 4 / 2006 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/28/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Current: \$ 67,867 | Projected: \$ 67,867 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 900 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Reconstruct Non-Compliant Furnace Creek Water System | | |
| Project No: 088691 | Unit/Facility Name: Death Valley National Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 25 | State: CA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.18 | FCI-Projected: 0.04 | API: 36 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will develop an appropriate water collection system to provide a reliable quality and quantity of potable water for the National Park Service, Xanterra resort facility (i.e. the Furnace Creek Inn and Ranch Resort), Timbisha Shoshone Indian tribe, and park visitors; and promote conservation of biological and cultural resource values in the Travertine-Texas Springs area. This project will also separate the delivery systems for potable and non-potable water in order to allow us to treat only the potable water, thereby decreasing the facility size and the life-cycle costs necessary for delivering potable water. Project work will include drilling up to four wells (with the actual number based on production rates) in the Texas Springs syncline. All potable water would be pumped from these wells. The potable water would be treated for arsenic, boron, fluoride, and total dissolved solids removal with a reverse osmosis treatment plant. The Furnace Creek Wash collection gallery would be moved to the lower end of the wash in order to reestablish the area as riparian habitat. The collection gallery would be used for non-potable water only. The project design will Incorporate alternative energy sources (photovoltaic) at the water treatment plant and well houses for level control and telemetry and will also utilize hydropower if feasible.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The Travertine Springs complex in the Furnace Creek area is probably the most critical water resource in Death Valley National Park. Potable and non-potable water is supplied by three springs: Furnace Creek Wash, Travertine Springs, and the Inn Tunnel (non-potable only). This series of springs provides water for all of the human use needs in the headquarters area including the park administrative offices, two private resort/visitor services facilities, and the offices and residences for the Timbisha Shoshone Indian Tribe. The Furnace Creek water system is unreliable, subject to catastrophic failure, and nearing the end of its useful life span. Many of the existing collection galleries have intermittently tested positive for coliform or E. coli bacteria, experienced unpredictable inputs of soil or organic matter, intermittently produced reduced volumes of water, and collected groundwater that does not meet state drinking water standards. Completion of the project will provide an adequate, reliable supply of safe water for human use in the headquarters area of the park. The springs also support a biological community that is totally dependent on these water resources including habitat for a minimum of seven endemic plant and animal species that have been identified by staff of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Desert Research Institute. In addition, installation of the existing collection galleries has resulted in a decrease in the presence and extent of water dependent plants and animals that were historically present in the areas below the galleries because many of the existing collection galleries do not have overflow pipes that automatically release water to the surrounding environment. In the summer of 1999, due to the presence of bacteria in the water supply, various collection galleries in the Travertine-Texas Springs area were taken off line. Water that was not collected was released to the local environment and park resources management staff determined that approximately seven miles of stream habitat are lost when the water is collected. Completion of the project will allow partial restoration of historic wetland and riparian habitat and improve flexibility for protecting species endemic to the area.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>25 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 25 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X | | Total Project Score: 900 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 4,343,000 | 75 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 1,448,000 | 25 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 5,791,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 5,791,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | \$ 5,791,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | 1/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: | 4/2006 | | 1/21/2005 | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 107,000 | Projected: \$ 171,000 | Net Change: \$ 64,000 |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 585 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Depew Recreation Facilities at Coppermine Site | | |
| Project No: 029465 | Unit/Facility Name: Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 05 | State: New Jersey |

Project Justification

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| FCI-Before: NA | | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | | API: 31 | |
| Project Description: This package would complete the relocation of the existing recreational facilities and traditional visitor use from the Depew recreation site and replace them nearby at the Coppermine site. Improvements to the new site would include the realignment and paving of existing access roads; the excavation and grading of approximately 300 linear feet of river shoreline to create a swim beach; construction of a 100- to 125-vehicle parking lot, a picnic area with tables, a public restroom, a lifeguard station, an entrance station, and a fenced storage area; and re-vegetation of disturbed areas. This request will be supplemented by funding from the Federal Lands Highway Program (FLHP) for construction of access roads and parking. | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Depew recreation site is one of the park's most popular areas, used by an estimated 600+ visitors per day on summer weekends. Depew has a history of recreational use dating back to at least the 1960s and a strong visitor following who have established traditions for use of the area including swimming. Depew became the de facto swim beach since there were no restrictions on swimming in the river and no designated swim beaches on the New Jersey side of the park. Visitor use has continued to increase leading to chronic overcrowding and blocked access for emergency vehicles that have become significant public safety concerns. Overcrowding has also lead to resource damage as visitors expanded into undeveloped and previously undisturbed areas, impacting formerly natural areas and threatening vegetated riverbanks, several populations of state-listed plant species, and prehistoric archeological resources. The Depew site had no potable water until very recently. There are no modern restroom facilities, only chemical portable toilets that produce many visitor complaints and contribute to litter and improper disposal of human waste in the woods and around the site. In the aftermath of two drownings at the site in 1999, planning was initiated for improvements at Depew. Initial studies raised significant concerns about river currents and habitat for a state-listed endangered species at Depew, leading to a decision to replace the facilities nearby at a more suitable swim beach location at the Coppermine site. Relocation of the recreational facilities and use will eliminate or reduce the risks and impacts at the Depew site. The new Coppermine facilities are being planned to address the deficiencies at Depew. Physical delineation of trails, walkways, and public use areas will avoid the expansion of social trails into undisturbed areas. The availability of modern, adequately sized toilet facilities will eliminate human waste around the site, thereby avoiding health risks to visitors and employees. The parking area will be relatively compact and constructed on fill, protecting any archeological resources underneath the site. The parking layout and circulation will be more efficient and convenient, and will accommodate more vehicle types. Consolidation of parking near the entrance will protect views from the river and will allow more space for passive recreation such as picnicking. Wayside signage will be used to educate visitors on environmentally responsible recreation. | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | | 25 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | |
| 35 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | |
| 40 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: | | NO: x | | Total Project Score: 585 | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---|--|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ 1,666,500 | 50 | Appropriated to Date: \$ 462,000 | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ 1,666,500 | 50 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 2,871,000 | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | | | \$ 3,333,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 | | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | | | Project Total: \$ 3,333,000 | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/yy) | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 2 / 2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental |
| Project Complete: | | | 2 / 2007 | | 1/19/2005 | | Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 49,435 | Projected: \$ 71,377 | Net Change: \$ 21,942 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 940 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Preserve Fort Jefferson | | |
| Project No: 016537 | Unit/Facility Name: Dry Tortugas National Park | |
| Region: Southeast | Congressional District: 20 | State: FL |

Project Justification

| | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.02 | FCI-Projected: 0.01 | API: 27 |
|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|

Project Description: The purpose of this project is to continue the long-term preservation of 150-year-old Fort Jefferson, the park's primary cultural resource, in a manner that provides the greatest benefit to this National Historic Landmark. The deterioration of the exterior (scarp) walls is due in part to harsh environmental conditions, but the most destructive force is the rust and expansion of massive iron armour blocks imbedded within each lower-level gun opening, or embrasure. The 7" thick iron blocks are expanding with tremendous force, creating a systemic, catastrophic failure of the scarp on the four fronts yet to be repaired. This project will focus first on the removal of all remaining iron components in the lower level embrasures of Fronts 3, 4, and 6 as described in item 1 below. Based on contract costs and availability of funds, the next priority for this project will be to stabilize the scarp wall, from the moat to the top of the parapet wall, focusing initially on completion of Front 4 and then on Front 5 as described in item 2 below. Project work then will include use of historically accurate or compatible materials to accomplish the following work in order of priority:

1. Demolition of the lower-level embrasures, removal of the iron Totten Shutters, iron armour blocks and associated components; and reconstruction with compatible bricks, mortar, coral concrete fill, and the use of cast stone to emulate the iron blocks with a compatible non-ferrous material.
2. Stabilization and repointing of the following by casemate section:
 - o Parapet, corbelled arches and blind embrasures at the top of the scarp wall.
 - o Stabilization of the upper level embrasures.
 - o Demolition and reconstruction of failing masonry as determined on-site during the construction process.
 - o Removal of all loose mortar and repointing using mortar compatible with the original historic fabric.

All workmanship is to be comparable to that achieved with the original construction, meeting both the letter and intent of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties for Rehabilitation.

Project Need/Benefit: The scarp wall, if allowed to decline and ultimately to fail, would expose more of the the inner coral concrete to the harsh environment and to an accelerated rate of decay. If this work is not completed, portions of the structure will continue to fail and related life-safety issues will increase. This would eventually threaten the integrity of the casemates, currently in use for both park operations and for public enjoyment, and ultimately the long-term existence of the structure. The intent of this project is not only to correct areas of failed masonry, but more importantly to prevent failure, thereby averting a much higher cost of recovery. The deterioration of the Fort's embrasures and the need for treatment has been documented over the past half-century, but was addressed only with limited operational funding. Recently, however, through a comprehensive two-year research, planning and design program, the best materials and methods for rehabilitation have been determined. Those results are being used in planning for this project and on an initial project, now underway, to rehabilitate the lower level embrasures on Front 5. If the entire project scope is implemented in this way, the life cycle for the areas treated by this project is projected to be another 150 years.

Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.

| | |
|--|---|
| 80 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance |
| 20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |

Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X **Total Project Score:** 940

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|------|-----------|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$'s | % | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 749,000 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 6,618,000 |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$ | 7,367,000 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | \$ 7,367,000 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award 1/2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: 4/2007 | | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 543,000 | Projected: \$ 543,000 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 680 |
| Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| Project Title: Modify Water Delivery System | | |
| Project No: 060109 | Unit/Facility Name: Everglades National Park | |
| Region: Southeast | Congressional District: 19,20 | State: Florida |

Project Justification

| | | |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
| FCI-Before: N/A | FCI-Projected: N/A | API: N/A |
|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|

Project Description: This project involves construction of modifications to the Central and Southern Florida (C&SF) Project water management system and related operational changes to provide improved water deliveries to Everglades National Park (ENP) as authorized by the 1989 ENP Protection and Expansion Act. The project consists of constructing additional water control structures and developing new operational plans to restore more natural hydrologic conditions within ENP. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) 1992 General Design Memorandum (GDM) detailed the initial project design for the Modified Water Deliveries (MWD) Project to restore the conveyance of water between water conservation areas north of ENP and the Shark River Slough within the Park. The plan also provided flood mitigation to the 8.5 Square Mile Area (SMA), a residential area adjacent to the Park expansion boundary in the East Everglades. Since the completion of the 1992 GDM, subsequent scientific investigations resulted in the identification of revised ecosystem restoration requirements. Additional scientific and engineering data analyses, in conjunction with improved hydrological and ecological modeling, indicated modifications to the 1992 GDM project features were warranted in order to better meet the original project objectives and improve compatibility with the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan project features, authorized in 2000. Much of the project work activity is now focused on completing the required supplemental National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents describing the needed revisions to the 1992 GDM project features. The project consists of four components: 1) 8.5 SMA, 2) Conveyance and Seepage Control, 3) Tamiami Trail, and 4) Project Implementation Support. The balance (FY 2006 thru FY 2009) of funding needed to complete the project is \$206 million, with \$60 million (\$25 million requested by NPS and \$35 million requested by the Corps) required in FY 2006.

The current status and [plans for FY 2006](#) are included below:

1) The purpose of the 8.5 SMA component is to provide flood mitigation to an agricultural and urban area adjacent to ENP due to the higher water levels in the area resulting from the construction of the project restoration features. The final design of the project component has been selected and is in the process of being implemented. The component features include the a perimeter levee, an internal canal and levee system, a pump station and storm water treatment area and the acquisition of lands adjacent to the ENP boundary and west of the perimeter levee. Much of the land acquisition activities will be completed in FY 2005. FY 2006 activities will focus on the construction of the structural features. The balance (FY 2006 thru FY 2009) of funding needed to complete this project component is \$47 million, with \$43.7 million (\$25 million being requested by NPS) required in FY 2006.

2) The purpose of the Conveyance and Seepage Control component is to convey water through reservoirs upstream of ENP into the Shark Slough drainage basin of ENP more consistent with historic hydrologic conditions. In addition, these project features will also return project-induced increased seepage from the project area to ENP in order to maintain flood protection to adjacent areas. Some of the features of this project component have been completed: the S-356 pump station, back-filling of the lower 4 miles of the L-67 extension canal, and construction of the S-355 structures in the L-29 levee. FY 2006 activities will focus on completing the necessary NEPA documents and the detailed design of the selected component conveyance features. The balance (FY 2006 thru FY2009) of funding needed to complete this project component is \$16 million, with \$2.2 million (none from NPS) required in FY 2006.

3) The purpose of the Tamiami Trail (U.S. 41) component is to modify the existing highway in a manner consistent with the increased water flows and levels resulting from the conveyance components of the project. In addition, these modifications must be designed to be consistent with Florida Department of Transportation requirements. Based on the selected plan identified in the FY 2005 Supplemental NEPA document, FY 2006 activities will focus on detailed design of the plan. The balance (FY 2006 thru FY 2009) of funding needed to complete this project component is \$127 million, with \$7.6 million (none from NPS) required in FY 2006.

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| <p>4) The purpose of the Project Implementation Support is to provide funding for needed ENP and Corps personnel, conduct environmental monitoring, develop improved operational plans, and complete the needed modifications to the Osceola Camp flood mitigation features. FY 2006 activities will include the continuation of personnel support and environmental monitoring, completion of the Combined Structural and Operational Plan for the MWD and C-111 Projects, and completion of the detailed design of the Osceola Camp modifications. The balance (FY 2006 thru FY 2009) of funding needed to complete this project component is \$16 million, with \$6.5 million (none from NPS) required in FY 2006.</p> | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: Research conducted in the Everglades National Park indicates substantial declines in the natural resources of the park and adjacent habitats. Much of this decline has been attributed to water management associated with the C&SF Project system. Since the park is located at the downstream terminus of the larger water management system, water delivery to the park is often in conflict with the other functions of the system, such as water supply and flood control. Construction of the project features and improved operational plans for water delivery will allow the timing, distribution and volumes of water delivery to the park to be more consistent with historic conditions. Some of the anticipated project benefits include increased connectivity of the Everglades ridge and slough habitats, improved conditions to the vegetation and aquatic communities due to increased duration of flooding in the slough and Rocky Glades habitats, improved hydrological conditions in the endangered Cape Sable Seaside Sparrow habitats, and increased flows to the estuaries to reduce the frequency of hypersaline events.</p> | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table> <tr> <td>0% Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td> <td>0% Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>0% Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td> <td>0% Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td> </tr> <tr> <td>80% Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td> <td>0% Other Capital Improvement</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20% Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> | | 0% Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0% Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0% Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0% Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 80% Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0% Other Capital Improvement | 20% Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0% Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0% Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | |
| 0% Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0% Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | |
| 80% Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0% Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | |
| 20% Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Required: YES: x NO: | Total Project Score: 680 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| <p>Project Cost Estimate:</p> <table> <tr> <th></th> <th>\$'s</th> <th>%</th> </tr> <tr> <td>Deferred Maintenance Work :</td> <td>\$ 0</td> <td>0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Capital Improvement Work:</td> <td>\$398,393,000**</td> <td>100</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Estimate:</td> <td>\$398,393,000**</td> <td>100</td> </tr> </table> <p>Class of Estimate: Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06</p> <p>Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award: 1/ 2006 Project Complete: 4/ 2009</p> | | \$'s | % | Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 0 | 0 | Capital Improvement Work: | \$398,393,000** | 100 | Total Project Estimate: | \$398,393,000** | 100 | <p>Project Funding History:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Appropriated to Date:</td> <td>\$192,393,000*</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Requested in FY 2006 Budget:</td> <td>\$ 60,000,000**</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Required to Complete Project:</td> <td>\$146,000,000**</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Project Total:</td> <td>\$398,393,000**</td> </tr> </table> | Appropriated to Date: | \$192,393,000* | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 60,000,000** | Required to Complete Project: | \$146,000,000** | Project Total: | \$398,393,000** |
|--|---|------------|---|-----------------------------|------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|-----|--------------------------------|------------------------|------------|--|-----------------------|----------------|------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | \$'s | % | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 0 | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$398,393,000** | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$398,393,000** | 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriated to Date: | \$192,393,000* | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 60,000,000** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Required to Complete Project: | \$146,000,000** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Total: | \$398,393,000** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/2005</p> | <p>Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Current: 0 | Projected: 0 | Net Change: 0 |
|-------------------|---------------------|----------------------|

* The amount of appropriations to date does not count the \$1.389 million of the FY 1999 appropriation directed by Congress to be used for the reorganization of the NPS's Construction Program. It includes the \$50 million of Land Acquisition funds directed to the Corps of Engineers (Corps) in the FY 2001 appropriation act for Corps land acquisition connected to this project, the \$3.796 million that the Secretary of the Interior transferred from the NPS Land Acquisition account to the NPS Construction account for work on this package, the \$16 million appropriation in the FY 2002 NPS Land Acquisition Program, and \$2 million transferred in FY 2004 from NPS Land Acquisition that had previously been appropriated as part of a grant to the State of Florida.

** The \$60 million in FY 2006 Budget Authority is composed of \$8 million of new NPS Construction appropriation funds, \$17 million in previously appropriated NPS Land Acquisition funds requested to be transferred for this project, and \$35 million to be requested in the FY 2006 President's Budget of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps). Under an agreement between the Department of the Interior and the Corps, the cost to complete the project after FY 2006 will be shared, with the Corps contributing an estimated additional \$89 million and the NPS an estimated additional \$42 million.

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 610 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------------|
| Project Title: Construct West Entrance Ranger Station and Restrooms | | |
| Project No: 077475 | Unit/Facility Name: Fire Island National Seashore | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 02 | State: New York |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|-----------------|
| FCI-Before: NA | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: New |
| Project Description: Construct a 1000-square-foot building to replace the west entrance station of Fire Island National Seashore. The building will serve as the west district ranger station, information center for visitors, and restroom for beach users. The previous kiosk at this location was removed because it was unsafe for employees or visitor use due to its construction and location. This new building will be located at the end of the state's paved road at the boundary between Robert Moses State Park and Fire Island NS. The building will be built as a model of sustainable design for barrier island using materials suitable for the beach environment and raised to a level that will prevent damage from periodic storm flooding. The change in the location of the building will allow better control over visitor access to the area. The new location and facilities will increase the ability of the park to monitor for endangered species protection, as well as archeological site and cultural resource protection of Lighthouse and annex buildings. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: There is no NPS facility at the west entrance. Unauthorized vehicles can access off-road areas in the area between the entrance and the current office. More than 200,000 vehicles travel the road at the adjoining state park and these vehicles must be physically stopped from entering without a permit. The adjacent beach is heavily used but there is no restroom for more than one-half mile. Visitors are unaware they are entering Fire Island National Seashore and have no opportunity for information or assistance. Water and first aid will be made available. Current offices in historic Coast Guard station will be removed, allowing for restoration of the building and the original Voice of America transmitter inside. Better monitoring of the access point will decrease the amount of unauthorized vehicle uses that have had impacts on endangered species nesting areas in the past. This facility will also decrease the number of vehicles that drive to the Lighthouse and park. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| <div>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</div> <div>30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</div> <div>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</div> <div>30 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</div> <div>40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</div> <div>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</div> <div>0 % Other Capital Improvement</div> | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 610 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | \$ 306,000 | 40 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | \$ 458,000 | 60 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 764,000 |
| Total Project Estimate: | | \$ 764,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 |
| Class of Estimate: | | B | | Project Total: | \$ 764,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | | 09/30/06 | | | |
| Dates: | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | | 1 / 2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental |
| Project Complete: | | 4 / 2006 | | 1/19/2005 | Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Current: \$ 0 | Projected: \$ 4,000 | Net Change: \$ 4,000 |
|----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 700 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Project Title: Stabilize and Restore North Officers' Quarters | | |
| Project No: 077446 | Unit/Facility Name: Fort Larned National Historic Site | |
| Region: Midwest | Congressional District: 01 | State: Kansas |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.49 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 33 |
| Project Description: The project will complete the restoration of the North Officers' Quarters. It will stabilize the exterior windows, doors and areas of failing stone masonry. The interior will be restored to the 1868 period. Site surface drainage which sends roof runoff toward the building will be addressed to the extent possible with rainwater collection system of gutters, downspouts and a possible cistern. Laboratory and on-site testing indicate application of a stone consolidant will greatly enhance masonry strength and reduce the absorption rate of the sandstone. Cellar walls below the kitchens were discovered to be only one wythe thick; they are now believed to need complete rebuilding. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The North Officers' Quarters is one of the most threatened buildings in the park. Little work, except for new roofs, has been done on it since the park was established in 1966. Exterior windows and doors are weathering rapidly which is resulting in loss of original fabric. Park maintenance performs patch jobs, but the building needs stabilization. The North Officers' Quarters has the most original fabric of any of the nine original buildings that comprise Fort Larned. The inside of the structure was used for housing during the farming/ranching period. It is in fair to poor condition and needs restoration to the historic period so that it can be opened to the public and interpreted. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 100 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 700 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 1,159,000 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 0 Total Project Estimate: \$ 1,159,000 100 | | | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 1,159,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 1,159,000 | |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 3 / 2006 Project Complete: 3 / 2007 | | | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/2005 | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Current: \$300.00 | Projected: \$ 9,600.00 | Net Change: \$9,300.00 |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 620 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------------|
| Project Title: Stabilize Fort Washington (Completion) | | |
| Project No: 021174 | Unit/Facility Name: Fort Washington Park | |
| Region: National Capital | Congressional District: 04 | State: Maryland |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.01 | FCI-Projected: 0.01 | API: 30 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: Funding proposed for FY2006 will complete the stabilization of Fort Washington – a circa 1824 masonry coastal fortification with 40- to 60-foot-high walls that enclose a three-acre parade ground and several buildings. The stabilization will be implemented under a three-phase project to urgently address and arrest those problems currently contributing to the short and long-term deterioration of this historic resource. The main thrust of this project is to prevent and control the penetration, saturation and damage caused by water through repairs to the drainage systems and repairs to the most significantly destabilized and cracked brick walls. In addition, all excessive vegetation growth will be eradicated and root-damaged brickwork repaired. Phase 1 will address and correct problems currently affecting the stability of the fort's walls and proper functioning of the fort's supporting drainage systems; phases 2 and 3 will address and correct those problems currently affecting the stability of supporting earthen terraces, slopes, structural buildings and features. Vegetation destroying the structure and currently affecting the successful implementation of work in both phases will also be removed. The primary work will include the inspection, evaluation and assessment of approximately 72,000 square feet of brickwork, 6,000 square feet of embankment and 53,211 square feet of grade drainage on the Parade Grounds. Furthermore, the interior and exterior of the Soldier's Barracks will be stabilized and the drainage for the Main Gate will be repaired. This project will include the replacement of all Portland cement mortar with lime mortar; stabilization of earthen embankments supporting the foundations, and repairs to the Soldier's Barracks.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: Historic Fort Washington Park was built 1814-24 and was used as an active military post through WWII. This fort is the best example of nineteenth century American Coastal Fortification remaining in the U.S. It is the only masonry fort built prior to the Civil War for the protection of the Nation's Capital. More than 265,000 visitors came to the park in 1997. Engineering reports, architectural evaluations and soil analysis reveal severe undermining of the walls and foundation due to the non-existent drainage system, the continual water penetration and pressure under the walls coupled with the extremely high volume and speed of water cascading along the walls and down the embankment further exacerbating the escalating erosion and structural failure. If these emergency corrective measures are not undertaken, a large and very visible portion of this fort will be lost and an even greater portion of the adjoining structures will be de-stabilized.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>20 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>30 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>50 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 20 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 30 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 50 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 20 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 30 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: X NO: | | Total Project Score: 620 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| | \$'s | % | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 4,587,500 | 50 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 6,299,000 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 4,587,500 | 50 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 2,876,000 |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$ 9,175,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | \$ 9,175,000 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award 1/2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: 4/2006 | | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 1,320,000 | Projected: \$ 1,360,000 | Net Change: \$ 40,000 |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 850 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitation of Arlington House, Outbuildings and Grounds | | |
| Project No: 016018 | Unit/Facility Name: George Washington Memorial Parkway | |
| Region: National Capital | Congressional District: 08 | State: VA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.06 | FCI-Projected: 0.01 | API: 30 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This modifies previous descriptions of this project submitted with the FY 2002 and FY 2003 funding requests, portions of which were rescinded with Congressional approval to address less-than-full restoration of FY2003 fire costs.. Further review of the scope of work during design has identified the following immediate needs to be completed by combining the remaining appropriated funds with the requested funding; additional work required for long-term preservation is being deferred to a future project: install an addressable fire detection and suppression system for Arlington House, the dependencies (slave quarters), potting shed, new comfort station and mechanical bunkers; install a new climate management mechanical system for the mansion (80%) and the north dependency; rehabilitate slave quarters in north dependency; replace roof of south dependency; improve site accessibility; demolish existing comfort station within historic area; construct new comfort station and new mechanical bunker outside the historic area; and salvage and relocate existing gas-fired boiler and pumps to new mechanical bunker for existing forced-air heating and underground mechanical-electrical-plumbing service to mansion and dependencies.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The purpose of this project is to address life and health safety hazards and the most critical preservation needs of the Arlington House and related historic structures and grounds. The existing fire detection system is incapable of identifying all vulnerable locations and alerting staff to a specific fire location in time to prevent catastrophic loss of historic fabric, so adequate fire protection will be provided for all structures on the site. Existing hazards to employees will be mitigated by upgrading electrical and communications systems sufficient to support the site's existing and future needs. Damage to artifacts and the interior of the structures caused by dust that is tracked into the mansion and inadequate climate control will be reduced by improving grounds and walkways and by upgrading mechanical systems. The historic fabric of the dependencies will be preserved by replacing a failing roof on the south dependency and rehabilitating the north dependency. The historic scene will be improved by removing the existing comfort station. Improvements to the grounds and walkways and replacement of the existing restrooms will also provide ADA-compliant facilities for employee and public use.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>30 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 30 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 30 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/> | | Total Project Score: 850 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| | \$'s | % | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 1,565,000 | 70 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 984,000 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 70,000 | 30 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 1,251,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 2,235,000 | 100 | Planned Funding: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | \$ 2,235,000 | | |
| Dates: | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |
| Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | |
| Construction Start/Award: 3/2006 | | | 1/19/2005 | | |
| Project Complete: 3/2007 | | | | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 936,000 | Projected: \$ 966,000 | Net Change: \$ 30,000 |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 805 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Remove Hazardous Materials and Correct Fire Egress at Many Glacier Hotel | | |
| Project No: 87500B | Unit/Facility Name: Glacier National Park | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: 01 | State: MT |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.47 | FCI-Projected: 0.46 | API: 28 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will prepare the Many Glacier Hotel for more extensive rehabilitation in other projects over the next several years by abating the most dangerous and exposed of the identified hazardous materials and bio hazards in the hotel. It eliminates those hazardous materials and corrects those biohazard conditions that present immediate health threats to both hotel guests and employees and that require a specialized hazardous materials contractor. The scope includes the following work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demolish all asbestos-wrapped heating pipes throughout the building and patch holes resulting from the pipe removal.• Remove asbestos wrap from the boiler in Annex II.• Abate asbestos-containing soils in the crawl spaces below the South Bridge, Annex I, North Bridge, Kitchen, and Dining Room that are accessed for routine maintenance by both concession and NPS employees.• Remove bat guano above the Dining Room, Kitchen and in guest room walls and replace or patch affected finishes.• Construct an exterior bat roost to assist in removing the bats from the Hotel and patch detectable bat access holes in the building.• Replace deteriorated exterior-egress stairs outside of the North Bridge and the Dining Room to meet fire code. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The Many Glacier Hotel is a large, impressive structure designed by St. Paul Minnesota architect, Thomas D. McMahon, and built from 1914 to 1917 at a cost of \$500,000. The hotel represents an important period in the development of the National Park Service and is a highly recognized National Historic Landmark. The hotel is the primary guest service facility in the Many Glacier Valley and is of great importance for serving park visitors. The 141,103-square-foot hotel is essentially a wood-frame structure with stone, masonry, steel, and concrete added as structural components. As a result of this standard construction, which closely resembles simple residential framing, problems have developed over the years due to the harsh climatic conditions and deferred maintenance. Following completion of the park's recent General Management Plan, three baseline studies were completed on the Many Glacier Hotel in 2001 (Condition Assessment, Draft Historic Structures Report, and Life Safety Assessment). The hotel was found to require major rehabilitation work to be compliant with building, life safety, and accessibility codes and standards. Rehabilitation will protect the 1.7 million park visitors and 200 concessionaire and park employees who use the facility annually as well as preserving the hotel's historic integrity. The three studies mentioned above were followed by a Capital Improvement & Implementation Plan that outlined a multi-year program to complete rehabilitation of the hotel. Other projects completed from 2002-2004 provided for repairs to the exterior building envelope, roof, balconies, and immediate life safety issues that have allowed the hotel to continue operation until long term repairs are made. As indicated above, this project will prepare the Many Glacier Hotel for additional projects that will each focus on complete rehabilitation and/or preservation of a different section of the hotel to eliminate the remaining serious structural, and life safety issues affecting the continued operation of the hotel.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>45 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred</td><td>10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>45 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 45 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred | 10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 45 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 45 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred | 10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/> | | Total Project Score: 805 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|------------------------|---------|----|---------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | | | | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ | 758,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | | | \$ | 0 | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ | 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | | | \$ | 758,000 | | |
| Total Component Estimate: | | | \$ | 758,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | | | \$ | TBD | | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | | | | Project Total: | | | | | \$ | 758,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | | Unchanged Since | | | |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 1/2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | | Departmental Approval: | | | |
| Project Complete: | | | 4/2006 | | | 1/20/2005 | | | YES: NO: X | | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 0 | Projected: \$ 0 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 630 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Establish Grand Portage Heritage Center | | |
| Project No: 008143 | Unit/Facility Name: Grand Portage National Monument | |
| Region: Midwest | Congressional District: 08 | State: MN |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: NA | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: New | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: This project will construct a 10,870-square-foot Heritage Center to orient and educate visitors to the monument in response to PL 85-910. The center will include a welcome and information desk, an auditorium, a sales area, restrooms, space for Ojibwa craft demonstrations, museum exhibit and storage areas for some of the 120,000 objects in the monument collection, a research library, and office space for monument staff. The facility will address the full range of interpretive themes (western exploration, ancient Native American trade network, pioneering commerce, fur trade, cross-cultural contact and accommodation, international boundary disputes/treaty), especially those that are not presently supported by present facilities such as continental exploration, cross-cultural accommodation, and Ojibwa heritage. The project will also include utility connections, safe pedestrian access to the monument's cultural resources/reconstructions, vehicular access and parking, and landscaping. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Established over 47 years ago, Grand Portage National Monument has never had a visitor center or an effective visitor orientation area. Without orientation to the site, few visitors are able to grasp the significance of Grand Portage. The recent General Management Plan (GMP) identified the heritage center as the monument's greatest need to help visitors better understand and appreciate the site, its importance in American and international history, and its resources. With the heritage center, the monument staff can better protect extensive museum collections and use them to illustrate the fur trade and Ojibwa heritage and can tell the breadth of the monument's story much more effectively. Construction of the center will also allow the reconstructed Great Hall (presently the <i>de facto</i> visitor center) to be used for its intended purpose --to interpret the history of the North West Company [fur trade] history, circa 1794 – and will also help protect sensitive cultural and natural resources at the stockade area. Visitors will be provided with year-round visitor services, including heated and adequately sized restrooms, in an easy-to-find, handicapped-accessible facility, as opposed to the present summer-months-only visitor services and small, unheated restrooms. All operations staff will be on-site in the new facility, reducing transportation expenses and increasing staff productivity by eliminating the present split in operations between the monument and a leased headquarters facility 36 miles away. Construction of the center will also honor a longstanding commitment to provide visitor services such as this center in exchange for the approximately 350 acres of land that the Grand Portage Band of Ojibwe donated to help create the Monument. The Band is an active partner in management of the Monument through an Indian Self-Governance Act Agreement and has participated fully in preparation of the recent GMP and environmental assessment, and in planning for the heritage center. The programs planned for the heritage center will provide visitors the "historic" story of the fur trade and Ojibwa heritage and allow the Band to expose visitors to a vibrant, contemporary Ojibwa culture. The location of the monument and heritage center at one end of a national scenic byway and the "North Shore" of Lake Superior, a destination vacation area for the Upper Midwest, will also provide the opportunity to dramatically increase visitation to more than 175,000 annually and increase employment opportunities for Grand Portage Band members – a goal stipulated in PL 85-910. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>15 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred</td><td>40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>15 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 15 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred | 40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 15 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 15 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred | 40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: | | Total Project Score: 630 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|----|-----------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 3,297,750 | 75 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 397,000 | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 1,099,250 | 25 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 4,000,000 | | |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 4,397,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 | | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | | \$ | 4,397,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since | | |
| Construction Start/Award | 2/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: | | |
| Project Complete: | 1/2007 | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: X | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 40,000 | Projected: \$ 25,000 | Net Change: \$ (15,000) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 645 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate 13 Historic Buildings for Western Preservation Center at White Grass Dude Ranch | | | |
| Project No: 094384 | | Unit/Facility Name: Grand Teton National Park | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: AL | State: WY | |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.45 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 21 |
| Project Description: In partnership with the National Trust, Grand Teton National Park proposes to rehabilitate and adaptively reuse the 13 historic buildings at White Grass Dude Ranch, located west of the park's headquarters, as a Western Preservation Center for Training and Technology. The Center will teach National Park Service employees and volunteers how to preserve, rehabilitate, and find new sustainable uses for historic rustic buildings in national parks in the Intermountain Region, initially focusing on structures in Grand Teton and Yellowstone national parks. These structures are in poor condition, including major deterioration to the roofs, sill logs, and foundations. These structures will be rehabilitated and adaptively reused for office space, a classroom, a shop, and housing for Center employees and trainees. In addition, utilities, including water, sewage, and electric, will be updated, and the historic road/entrance will be stabilized. Access to the center will be via a newly constructed short spur road from the existing adjacent Death Canyon road. The exact furnishings needed for the Center are undetermined at this time. The park will submit a separate funding proposal for this component in the future. It is estimated this one-time project will take up to 3 years to complete using park personnel, contractors, and volunteer laborers. The project will begin once funding is acquired, and it will be the first Center project to provide "hands-on" training. Harrison Goodall, a log expert and park contractor, conducted condition assessments and cost estimates for the 13 buildings in October of 2002. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The need for NPS employees in Grand Teton and the Intermountain Region to learn historic preservation technology and techniques for rustic architecture is immediate. The training, technology, and skills necessary to preserve, rehabilitate, restore, and maintain rustic structures are simply not available in today's western parks and surrounding communities. A center to develop those skills is necessary to address a large backlog of preservation and maintenance needs for rustic buildings park- and region-wide. The adaptive reuse of White Grass, the third oldest dude ranch in Jackson Hole Valley, will save the rustic log buildings from becoming irretrievable ruins, and it will eliminate the hazardous and unsafe conditions that currently exist at the abandoned buildings. White Grass Dude Ranch was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in April 1990. It is significant locally, if not regionally, because as a dude ranch it helped define and set the standards for the Jackson Hole dude ranching industry. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 10 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 65 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| 15 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 10 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X | | Total Project Score: 645 |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|---|------------|-----------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$1,673,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 1,673,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$1,673,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: | B | | Project Total: | \$ | 1,673,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | 09/30/06 | | | | |
| Dates: | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | | |
| Construction Start/Award | 1/2006 | | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: | 1/20/2005 | |
| Project Complete: | 4/2007 | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 5,000 | Projected: \$ 160,000 | Net Change: \$ 155,000 |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 840 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Fort Pickens Water System | | |
| Project No: 067330 | Unit/Facility Name: Gulf Islands National Seashore | |
| Region: Southeast | Congressional District: 01 | State: FL |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.44 | FCI-Projected: 0.11 | API: 28 |
| Project Description: This project will rehabilitate and upgrade the existing substandard water system at Fort Pickens to improve the drinking water quality and reliability and to bring the water system in compliance with the drinking water regulations by improving the operation of the system and by maintaining the required chlorine residual throughout the distribution systems. Project work will include adding an additional, larger water storage tank to supplement the existing 8,000-gallon storage tank, constructing a new larger-capacity water-distribution recirculating line, replacing the old injection gas chlorinating system with a new water treatment system, installing a new backup generator and an electrical pump-control system to allow for continuous operation of the water system during power outages, and removing the old diesel generator. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Over 1,500,000 visitors come to Ft. Pickens every year. The water system at Fort Pickens supplies water to all the campground sites and restrooms, all outlying restrooms, historical structures, maintenance facilities and the fishing pier. The present water system cannot meet the current demand for water use. The present water distribution system is unreliable and the disinfection requirement is difficult to maintain throughout the system. In addition, the system does not comply with applicable codes and regulations. Routine inspections in 1999 and 2000 by the Florida State Rural Water Association and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) identified deficiencies that need improvement to comply with the FDEP drinking water regulations. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. 60 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 20 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 840 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 777,000 80 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 194,000 20 Total Component Estimate: \$ 971,000 100 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 971,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 971,000 | |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | Dates: Sch'd (qtr/yy) Construction Start/Award 1/2006 Project Complete: 4/2006 | |
| | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005 | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Current: \$ 26,000 | Projected: \$ 28,000 | Net Change: \$ 2,000 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 750 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Salvage Archeological Resources Threatened By Erosion | | |
| Project No: 001409 | Unit/Facility Name: Hopewell Culture National Historical Park | |
| Region: Midwest | Congressional District: 07 | State: OH |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|----|------|----|--|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: | NA | FCI-Projected: | NA | API: | NA | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: This project began as a proposal entitled "Stabilize Riverbank at Hopewell Mound Group" that would protect archeological resources from an actively eroding steep vertical river cut-bank by accomplishing necessary archeological compliance, grading the bank (20 to 30 feet high), installing soil stabilization material, rock protection, screening walls and plantings, and seed with appropriate vegetation at a cost in excess of \$1,000,000. However, a range of alternatives was considered during the pre-design phase and all construction alternatives would impact the archeological resources and therefore would require mitigation (salvage) of resources. It became apparent that the most prudent and fiscally responsible course of action was to forego stabilization of the riverbank and focus on mitigation of further loss of the cultural resources. The current proposed project is to salvage archeological resources that are threatened by erosion, and allow the river bank to continue eroding. This alternative had the highest advantages and lowest cost of any of the action alternatives and it can be implemented quickly when funding becomes available. The majority of erosion occurs during spring and early summer when rainfall and runoff is heaviest. To prevent further significant erosion and possible loss of archeological resources, the project should be completed as soon as funds can be made available. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Approximately 1,000 feet of river bank that forms part of the southern boundary of the recently acquired Hopewell Mound Group unit is being severely eroded and needs to be stabilized. A sharp oxbow in the North Fork of Paint Creek causes catastrophic erosion during periods of high water. At least 155' of the bank has been lost since 1976. Existing vegetation offers little or no stabilization. The erosion site is about 1,000 feet long, and the bank drops vertically for 20 to 30 feet to the river. The erosion is actively destroying a 2000-year-old archeological site associated with the Hopewell Mound Group. The yearly rate of erosion varies depending on the severity of spring flooding. During periods of high runoff several feet of bank can be eroded in just a few days. The primary issue resulting from the erosion is damage being caused to the archeological resource. The exact nature and extent of the archeological resource in the area being eroded is unknown. However, because of its proximity to the Hopewell Mound Group and to Paint Creek, and from the results of past archeological surveys, the probability is high that significant subsurface Hopewellian resources are present. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>20 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>80 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | | | | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 20 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 80 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 80 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 750 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----|---------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|---------|---------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ | 0 | 0 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ | 389,000 | 100 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 389,000 | |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ | 389,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | | \$ | 389,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since | | |
| Construction Start/Award 1/2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: | | |
| Project Complete: 4/2006 | | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: X | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 0 | Projected: \$ 0 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 880 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Bathhouses for Adaptive Reuse | | |
| Project No: 056091D | Unit/Facility Name: Hot Springs National Park | |
| Region: Midwest | Congressional District: 04 | State: AR |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.89 | | FCI-Projected: 0.03 | API: 30 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: Bathhouse Row is a collection of eight historic bathhouse structures, located in a National Historic Landmark District. They range in size from 12,000 square feet to over 28,000 square feet. This project will stabilize and rehabilitate the bathhouses in several phases for their preservation and adaptive use by removing hazardous asbestos and lead-based paint; completing major structural repairs; replacing/repairing roofs, skylights, windows, and doors; repairing floors and walls; containing water penetrations into basements; replacing HVAC electrical, and plumbing systems; repairing/replacing deteriorated staircases; and complying with requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Structural work includes needed repairs to concrete/steel supporting beams, cracks in concrete floors and roof decks; exposed concrete reinforcing bars in floor and roof decks; and settled or cracked concrete footings for walls and flooring. This final phase of the project will place the Maurice and Superior bathhouses into a tenant-ready condition where they can be adaptively reused through the historic leasing and/or concessions program, and will fully rehabilitate the Lamar Bathhouse for adaptive reuse by the park for office space, meeting space, library, curatorial storage, and general storage.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: One bathhouse, the Buckstaff, has remained open under a concession contract and the Fordyce Bathhouse has been rehabilitated and adapted for use as the park's visitor center and museum. The remaining six bathhouses have been closed for several years and are in deteriorated condition. Visitors on Bathhouse Row cannot be allowed access to the bathhouses; this restriction must remain in effect until the structures are rehabilitated. This project will continue work that has previously been done which includes: asbestos and lead-based paint was removed from the six bathhouses, the collapsed front area of the Ozark Bathhouse was rebuilt; and repair of windows and doors was partially completed in the Quapaw and Ozark Bathhouses. An ongoing contract is completing roof replacement at the bathhouses. The same ongoing contract is completing HVAC systems to stabilize humidity levels and completing structural stabilization in all six buildings. Completion of this project will bring the six bathhouses into a condition where they can be adaptively used by the park or through the concessions program, historic leasing program, or other leasing program. The park's GMP recognized the historical importance of these structures and states that they be rehabilitated and preserved through adaptive reuse. This project will implement GMP recommendations and fulfill the mission of the National Park Service in preserving historical/cultural resources. It will also provide more opportunities for visitors, and improve relationships with the community by changing run-down, deteriorated structures into useful, functional buildings.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>80 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | | 80 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 80 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: X NO: | | Total Project Score: 880 | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|---------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | | |
| | \$'s | % | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$19,391,000 | 100 | Appropriated/Requested to Date: | \$ | 13,332,000 | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 6,059,000 | |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$19,391,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | | \$ 19,391,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since | |
| Construction Start/Award | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: | |
| Project Complete: | | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 22,000 | Projected: \$ 120,000 | Net Change: \$ 98,000 |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 550 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Deshler-Morris/Bringhurst House Utilities and Exhibit Rehabilitation | | |
| Project No: 019891 | Unit/Facility Name: Independence National Historical Park | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 01 | State: PA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---|--|---|---|--|--------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.42 | FCI-Projected: 0.01 | API: 28 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: The Deshler-Morris House is one of the most historically significant homes in Philadelphia. In 1973 the adjoining Bringhurst House was added to serve as a visitor orientation and exhibit space for tours of the Deshler-Morris House. Project estimates were developed and proposed over the years but due to a lack of funding, nothing else was done. Now both houses are threatened with antiquated utilities, inadequate fire/intrusion alarms, hazardous materials, deteriorating historic fabric, and a lack of basic visitor facilities (including public restrooms). This project will replace a 40-year-old HVAC system; provide a complete fire suppression system and emergency electrical lighting, upgrade intrusion alarms and plumbing/electrical systems, provide a real time communications link (possibly video) with the park (8 miles away), complete overdue repairs on the original wood and masonry, replace leaking roofs, provide structural supports and subsurface drainage, produce exhibits for a new orientation area, provide public restrooms and accessibility ramps, and remove hazardous materials.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: This historic resource is unique and irreplaceable for a couple of reasons. The Deshler-Morris house first served as headquarters for British General Howe during the Battle of Germantown in 1777. Also known as the Germantown "White House", this site was later home to President Washington and his family in 1793 & 1794. It is the oldest existing presidential residence in the United States, is on the National Register of Historic Places, on the list of Classified Structures, and is one of the most intact 18th century structures in America (Deshler-Morris house is 80% original fabric). The Bringhurst House is now vacant, except for an employee housing unit and in poor condition. Located 8 miles from the core park buildings of Independence National Historical Park, the houses are vulnerable to catastrophic damage or loss due to antiquated utilities, lack of fire suppression, intrusion alarms, and deteriorating original fabric. This project would dramatically reduce routine and emergency oversight by park law enforcement and maintenance staff, also stationed 8 miles from the site. Long overdue building and utility repairs will greatly reduce physical threats, preventing further damage to original historic fabric and museum collections. The new visitor orientation area would include interpretive exhibits and public restrooms supporting tours of the historic Deshler-Morris house. Adding accessible public restrooms, interpretive exhibits will meet basic visitor expectations. Accessibility ramps would better serve the majority of our elderly volunteer guides along with a significant portion of our visitors. Visitation to the Deshler-Morris House has significantly increased since 1997 due to organized efforts in the Germantown area to increase tourism and school educational programs at historic sites.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>10 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>10 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 10 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 10 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 550</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|----------|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| | \$'s | % | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 3,538,800 | 90 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 393,200 | 10 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 3,932,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 3,932,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | \$ 3,932,000 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award 2/2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: 2/2007 | | | 1/21/2005 | | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 30,000 | Projected: \$ 30,000 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|

National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | NA |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| Project Title: Complete Landscaping on Independence Mall | | |
| Project No: 0089616 | Unit/Facility Name: Independence National Historical Park | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 01 | State: PA |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---------|
| FCI-Before: 0.21 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 24 |
| Project Description: This will provide federal funding towards the completion of the \$300 million Independence Mall Redevelopment Project. These funds will be added to existing partner funds towards the completion of the landscape treatment on Independence Mall. Included in this scope of work will be the demolition and removal of the previous Liberty Bell Pavilion. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: NPS has been working with a number of other governmental entities (City of Philadelphia, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania) and private foundations in the development of four new buildings and the associated landscape treatment of the three-block Independence Mall. These funds will be leveraged with additional private funds to complete this project. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: NA | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|--|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 0 0 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 0 Total Component Estimate: \$ 6,742,000 100 Class of Estimate: A Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 4,742,000 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 2,000,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 6,742,000 |
| Dates: Construction Start/Award 1/2006 Project Complete: 4/2006 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Current: \$146,132 | Projected: \$146,132 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|--------------------|----------------------|------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 900 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| Project Title: Replace Non-Compliant Sewage Cesspools per State and EPA Mandates | | | |
| Project No: 088271 | | Unit/Facility Name: Kalaupapa National Historical Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 02 | State: HI | |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.11 | FCI-Projected: 0.01 | API: 33 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: The purpose of this project is to provide a wastewater disposal system meeting current environmental regulations that will eliminate the use of 21 large-capacity cesspools (flows greater than 1,000 gallons per day) as the primary wastewater treatment within the Kalaupapa Settlement on the island of Molokai, per State and EPA mandates. This project will provide septic tanks for primary treatment of wastewater and use either seepage pits or drainfields for the disposal of effluent. Project work will include the installation of septic tanks, closure of existing cesspools, construction of seepage pits or drainfields, and provision of a solid waste handling facility for the dewatering and disposal of solids from the septic tanks. In some cases, it may be possible to reuse existing cesspools as seepage pits. Final design decisions to use seepage pits or drainfields will depend upon site-specific soil conditions -- currently only three sites are under consideration for drainfields. The use of drainfields for these sites will be determined when field work is completed. The final design will meet all existing environmental regulations for wastewater treatment. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: There are over 200 public buildings and 110 residences in the National Historic Landmark of Kalaupapa Settlement. Approximately 145 residents produce between 6,000 and 10,000 gallons of wastewater per day. Wastewater is produced from residential buildings, offices, restaurants and hospital and healthcare facilities. Currently 95 percent of wastewater produced in the park goes untreated into the ground through cesspools. In 2000, the EPA approved a new rule eliminating the use of Class V injection wells (large-capacity cesspools). Large capacity cesspools are defined as those serving 20 or greater users per day or receiving 1,000 gallons of wastewater or greater per day. The National Park Service management policy and Director's Order 83 cite the use of cesspools as inappropriate in a national park. The continued use of cesspools is a significant threat to public health. Kalaupapa Settlement is located on a peninsula of volcanic geologic formations, lava tubes and is within close proximity to the ocean. About 90 percent of the development is within 2200 feet of the shore. Fourteen of the twenty-one facilities in this project have existing cesspools within 500 feet of the shoreline. The potential for polluting the beaches, coral reefs and the general near shore environment is extremely high. This of particular concern for the federally listed endangered Hawaii Monk Seals who have used these beaches to rear pups for the last five years. A comprehensive study is currently being conducted to formulate a plan for mitigating the parkwide dependence upon cesspools. Eliminating the use of large-capacity cesspools at these 17 facilities will not only comply with the EPA mandate, but will implement the first phase of the comprehensive plan to ultimately eliminate cesspool use throughout the settlement and entire peninsula. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>40 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>40 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 40 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 10 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 40 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 900 | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|----|-----------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 1,889,500 | 50 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 1,889,500 | 50 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 3,779,000 | | |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 3,779,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 | | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | | \$ | 3,779,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since | | |
| Construction Start/Award | 2/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: | | |
| Project Complete: | 4/2006 | | 1/21/2005 | | YES: NO: x | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 59,502 | Projected: \$ 90,217 | Net Change: \$ 30,715 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 830 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Failed and Leaking Water Distribution Systems, Parkwide | | |
| Project No: 055928 | Unit/Facility Name: Lake Mead National Recreation Area | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: NV 01, AZ 03 | State: NV, AZ |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.33 | FCI-Projected: 0.05 | API: 23 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: This project will provide selective improvements to the water distribution systems at major developed areas at Lake Mead National Recreation Area (NRA) in two phases in conjunction with work on wastewater systems within the same developed areas under project 055926. Major components of the work include replacing aged and deteriorated mains; replacing aged and inoperable main-line valves and adding additional valving; replacing existing mains with upsized lines to meet code requirements for flow; the addition of new mains to create loops that increase system efficiency and reliability, reduce outages, and provide required flows; replacing old and inoperable fire hydrants and adding additional fire hydrants to meet code requirements; adding additional metering to better monitor and manage water usage; adding additional water storage where required to meet flow requirements; upgrading and adding additional backflow prevention devices to meet current code requirements; and replacing existing campground surface flood irrigation systems with subsurface drip irrigation systems to reduce potable water consumption. Phase 1 (this request) will focus on needed improvements at Temple Bar, Katherine Landing, and Cottonwood Cove; Phase 2 will focus on needed improvements at Overton Beach, Boulder Beach, Echo Bay, Callville Bay, and Las Vegas Bay. Phase 1 will also provide for critical selective improvements at Willow Beach. A future construction project (number 059810) will address the majority of water system needs at Willow Beach. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Lake Mead NRA currently serves over 10 million visitors annually. Most visitor services are provided at nine developed areas. Public facilities include campgrounds, picnic areas, and boat launch ramps. Additional visitor services are provided by four separate private-sector concessionaires and include marinas, RV and trailer parks, restaurants, stores, and lodging. Utility infrastructure at each developed area makes possible and supports the various visitor services. The water distribution systems at the nine developed areas suffer from a number of critical deficiencies. Aged lines are currently in a deteriorated condition and have reached their life expectancy. Additional visitor facilities have been added over the years and the existing systems have been extended piecemeal without regard to overall efficient system operation. Many lines do not have adequate flow capacity to meet current and anticipated future demand. The existing water systems do not meet current code requirements for fire flows. As a result, the existing water systems do not adequately provide for life safety and they create an increased risk of property loss. Fire hydrants are not located within required distances of structures and there is insufficient capacity to meet flow demands should building fire sprinkler systems be added. Existing valves are in many cases frozen open and there are insufficient valves to isolate sections for maintenance or repair. The overall configuration of lines and valves does not provide a dependable and reliable system. It is estimated that 11-million gallons of treated water are lost annually. This loss represents the waste of a valuable resource in a desert environment and also represents an economic loss due to the cost of pumping and treating the water. Backflow prevention does not meet current code requirements and as a result there is an increased risk to public health due to contamination. There is currently inadequate metering to effectively manage water usage, identify locations of water losses, and identify opportunities for conservation. The purpose of this project is to address the above critical deficiencies and bring the water distribution systems up to current codes and standards, NPS policies, and into full compliance with all regulatory requirements. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: | | Total Project Score: 830 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$11,784,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 6,642,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | | | \$11,784,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 5,142,000 |
| Class of Estimate: | | | B | | Project Total: | \$ 11,784,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | | | 09/30/06 | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 2/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: | | | 1/2007 | | 1/20/2005 | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|----------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------|
| Current: | \$ 714,000 | Projected: | \$ 714,000 | Net Change: | \$ 0 |
|----------|------------|------------|------------|-------------|------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 970 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Failed, Non-Compliant Wastewater Systems, Parkwide | | |
| Project No: 055926A | Unit/Facility Name: Lake Mead National Recreation Area | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: NV 01, AZ 03 | State: NV, AZ |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.20 | FCI-Projected: 0.03 | API: 29 |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|

Project Description: This project will rehabilitate the existing wastewater collection systems at major developed areas within Lake Mead National Recreation Area in two phases in conjunction with work on water systems within the same areas under project number 055928. Major components of the work include replacing deteriorated force mains and associated air relief valves; replacing or rehabilitating deteriorated manholes; replacing deteriorated manhole frames and covers; replacing or relining existing deteriorated gravity sewer lines; providing odor control for vented sewer gases at selected locations; realigning sections of existing gravity sewer lines; increasing the capacity of selected gravity lines; and providing other miscellaneous upgrades to improve the reliability and efficiency of the wastewater collection system. Phase 1 (this request) will focus on improvements at Temple Bar, Katherine Landing, and Cottonwood Cove; Phase 2 will focus on improvements at Overton Beach, Boulder Beach, Echo Bay, Callville Bay, and Las Vegas Bay to complete the project.

Project Need/Benefit: Lake Mead NRA currently serves over 10-million visitors annually. Most visitor services are provided at nine developed areas (six areas are located in Nevada, three are in Arizona). The wastewater collection systems serve marinas, campgrounds, picnic areas, trailer villages, concessioner facilities, NPS operational and maintenance facilities, and employee housing. The wastewater system in one of the developed areas was constructed during the pre-WWII era of the CCC and WPA and the other eight during the 1950s and 1960s. These systems have had minimal preventive maintenance over the years and are now severely deteriorated and failing. A recent contract for hydro-flushing and videotaping of all wastewater collection systems parkwide has confirmed the previously suspected condition, that these systems are in an advanced stage of deterioration and suffer from severely corroded pipes, failing manholes, and leakage of raw sewage throughout the park. Without immediate attention, these systems will experience continued deterioration, continued infiltration and exfiltration (leakage), pipe breakage, and collapse of individual manholes. Failure of these force mains, gravity mains and manholes would cause significant risks to public health and the environment due to discharges of raw sewage from these systems. Sewage is generated at the lowest point in these systems due to waste-generating activities occurring close to the lake, so the pristine water quality of Lake Mead and Lake Mohave could be jeopardized if there were a major spill caused by catastrophic failure of one of these mains. Failure of any force main will virtually shut down all commercial, residential and recreational use within the development and could expose visitors and employees and their families to the risk of disease transmission via direct physical contact with raw sewage, as well as undermining roads, buildings, utility lines or other structures due to high-pressure spray. As a result of these extensive problems with the wastewater systems throughout the park, the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection has drafted a formal Consent Agreement, containing stipulated penalties, which alleges NPS violation of state and federal water pollution control requirements. The purpose of this project is to address the above critical deficiencies and bring the wastewater collection systems up to current codes and standards, and into full compliance with NPS policies and all regulatory requirements.

Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.

| | |
|--|---|
| 90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance |
| 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |

Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: **X** **Total Project Score:** **970**

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----|---|-------------------|-----------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 7,044,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 2,697,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 7,044,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 4,347,000 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | \$ | 7,044,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | | | |
| Construction Start/Award | 2/2006 | | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: | 1/20/2005 | |
| Project Complete: | 1/2007 | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 331,000 | Projected: \$ 331,000 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 800 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Jackson Visitor Center & Rehabilitate Parking Areas, Phase 1 | | |
| Project No: 016396 | Unit/Facility Name: Mount Rainier National Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 08 | State: WA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|------|---------------------------------|----|---|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: | NA | FCI-Projected: | 0.00 | API: | 22 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: This project will rehabilitate the Paradise National Historic Landmark District (NHLD) by removing the existing 60,000-square-foot Henry M. Jackson Visitor Center (JVC); improving Paradise developed area access, parking, and circulation; and constructing a new, smaller visitor center (approximate 20,000 square feet). Included in the project will be all site work, landscaping, utilities, exhibits, production of a new park movie, and demolition of the existing JVC. Due to the remoteness of the Paradise area, the short construction season, the logistical difficulties posed by the site, and the potential for significant cost savings, the National Park Service is also requesting special legislative authority to conduct a single procurement for construction of the full scope of this project and another Paradise area project (number 006215) that would include both projects over two to three years, subject to the availability of appropriated funds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: On a typical winter snow year, the Henry M. Jackson Visitor Center uses from 300 to 500 gallons per day of diesel fuel for primarily reducing snow loading on the roof (i.e., snow melt) and space heating. An Architectural/Engineering Feasibility Study and Value Analysis completed by the Denver Service Center in August 1996 acknowledged that failure of the 36-year old snow melt system embedded in the concrete roof structure would make it completely infeasible to rehabilitate the facility. The building has 23,000 square feet of heated circulation space that significantly exceeds the public space needed for even peak visitor days at Paradise. Increasing visitor complaints and the public's heightened awareness of accessibility, historic integrity and energy conservation has resulted in expectations for action. Since its construction in the 1960's, the JVC has fallen below current building codes, OSHA codes and American with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines. Architecturally, the JVC significantly clashes with the NHLD at Paradise. A recent OSHA inspection cited the park for failing to have two means of egress during the winter. These problems place the service in legal jeopardy if injury or death occurs during an access accident or catastrophe such as fire or earthquake. Snow may be removed to accommodate the second means of egress, however the walkways are still too slippery and steep for legal access, and the snow banks (often exceeding 20-feet in height) along the walkway would be constantly in danger of collapse causing injury and possible death to visitors and employees. Cost estimate to bring the structure up to acceptable safety standards, with two all season entries, elevator(s), and upgraded exhibits, etc., is in excess of \$17 million life cycle cost (net) without factoring roof snow melt system replacement. The roof structure is not structurally designed to withstand the area's 500+ pounds per square foot snow loading. The very large fuel consumption contributes to the area's air quality degradation and is not in keeping with the National Park Service's or Mount Rainier National Park's Resource Stewardship role as a Class 1 area or leader in sustainability! | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>70 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | | | | 70 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 70 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: X NO: | | | | Total Project Score: 800 | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$18,910,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 14,307,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$18,910,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 4,603,000 |
| Class of Estimate: A | | | Project Total: | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | \$ 18,910,000 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award 2/2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: 1/2009 | | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 75,000 | Projected: \$ 25,000 | Net Change: \$ (50,000) |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 880 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Failing Structural Components of Paradise Inn and Annex, Phase 1 | | |
| Project No: 006215 | Unit/Facility Name: Mount Rainier National Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 08 | State: WA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.42 | FCI-Projected: 0.07 | API: 26 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: The purpose of this project is to correct serious health, life, and safety threats to park visitors and employees and to protect the Paradise Inn and Annex. This historic park facility is located at 5,200 feet on the southwest slopes of Mount Rainier in the Paradise district. The harsh winter conditions (an average 50 feet of snow fall per year) have placed significant pressure on all structural components. In 1996, a professional structural assessment determined that the rubble foundation, hearths and other structural components of the hotel are failing and catastrophic failure could occur. The project will be phased and completed over a two- to three-year period and will reconstruct portions of the buildings, correcting identified deficiencies to bring them into compliance with the Uniform Building Code and with National Fire Protection Act and Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. This rehabilitation project will complete structural and egress system and other upgrades to the historic portions of the Paradise Inn, including the following work:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Lobby/ Gift Shop: complete structural risk mitigation, repair historic main stair, rehabilitate concession areas, and upgrade mechanical systems• Dining Room: complete structural risk mitigation, install accessible lift, upgrade sanitary sewer, install new galvanized water pipe• Kitchen: complete structural risk mitigation, rebuild grease hood, upgrade fire protection• East Wing: complete structural risk mitigation, install new egress stair, complete 1-hour rated corridors, provide seven new ADA-accessible guest rooms, upgrade sanitary sewer, install new galvanized water pipe• Annex: complete structural risk mitigation• Snow Bridge: complete structural risk mitigation• Site: redirect drainage away from building <p>Depending upon the construction bidding climate and contract costs, completion of the Annex and Snow Bridge rehabilitation may need to be funded by other than line item fund sources. Due to the remoteness of the Paradise area, the short construction season, the logistical difficulties posed by the site, and the potential for significant cost savings, the National Park Service is also requesting special legislative authority to conduct a single procurement for construction of the full scope of this project and another Paradise area project (number 016396) that would include both projects over two to three years, subject to the availability of appropriated funds.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The Paradise Inn and Annex are listed on the National Register of Historical Places and both were designated National Historical Landmarks in 1987. The facility is located in the Paradise area, the heart of the park and a region which receives 40 to 90 feet of snow annually. While collectively known as the Paradise Inn, the facility is actually composed of several buildings: Lobby and Dining Wings, Gift Shop and Snack Bar Addition, East Wing, Snow Bridge, Annex, and Kitchen Addition. Since 1916, modifications and makeshift additions such as roof dormers, snow bridge and chimney supports have also added complexity and dysfunction to the structures. Each component has varying degrees of strength and deficiencies. None of the components were constructed to resist the high snow loads of Paradise and have been tweaked, torn and twisted apart through the years. Foundations are compressed, deformed or shifted leaving the building susceptible to collapse under the snow or seismic events. Degradation of exterior fabrics caused by constant moisture is causing accelerated deterioration throughout the structures. Failure to rehabilitate this complex would continue serious life / health / safety threats to employees and park visitors, and could result in the catastrophic loss of nationally significant historic resources and cause serious impacts to visitor services, park interpretive programs, and the primary concessionaire.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>60 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 60 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 60 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: | | Total Project Score: 880 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|-----|---------------------------------|------------------------|------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| | \$'s | % | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 15,984,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 7,900,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 15,984,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 8,084,000 |
| Class of Estimate: | B | | Project Total: | \$ | 15,984,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | 09/30/06 | | | | |
| Dates: | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since | |
| Construction Start/Award | 2/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental Approval: | |
| Project Complete: | 1/2008 | | 1/20/2005 | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|----------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|
| Current: | \$ 0 | Projected: | \$ 0 | Net Change: | \$ 0 |
|----------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 300 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|
| Project Title: Restore Elwha River Ecosystem and Fisheries | | |
| Project No: 005375 | Unit/Facility Name: Olympic National Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 06 | State: Washington |

Project Justification

| | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|
| FCI-Before: NA | FCI-Projected: NA | API: 0 |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|---------------|

Project Description: The Department of the Interior has determined that removal of two hydroelectric projects on the Elwha River is required to fully restore the Elwha River ecosystem and fisheries. This project is for the purposes of meeting requirements of the Elwha River Ecosystem and Fisheries Restoration Act (P.L. 102-495), restoring the largest watershed in Olympic National Park, ending litigation regarding jurisdiction over the Glines Canyon project, and addressing the Federal Government's treaty responsibilities to the Elwha S'Klallam Tribe. This is a cooperative effort among four Department of Interior agencies, including the National Park Service, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Reclamation (BOR) and the Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps) and Lower Elwha S'Klallam Tribe (the Tribe). The overall project will involve:

1. Acquisition of the Elwha and Glines Canyon hydroelectric projects, and associated land and facilities (COMPLETED).
2. Preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to examine methods of dam removal and ecosystem (COMPLETED) and a supplemental EIS to examine alternatives for protection of downstream water users (UNDERWAY).
3. Preparation of de-construction and restoration plans based on the selected removal alternative (UNDERWAY).
4. Installation of water quality protection measures for downstream water users according to the selected alternative for dam removal (UNDERWAY).
5. Removal of the Elwha and Glines Canyon dams (2008-2011), restoration of the Lake Mills and Lake Aldwell reservoir areas, restoration of Elwha fisheries, and monitoring of the restoration efforts (2009-2021).
6. Other actions including interim operations and maintenance of the projects for power production by BOR and the Bonneville Power Administration, development of on-reservation flood mitigation by the Tribe and identification of measures needed off-reservation by the Corps of Engineers, and mitigation of cultural resources impacts. (UNDERWAY).

Project Need/Benefit: The Elwha River Ecosystem and Fisheries Restoration Act (P.L. 102-495) directed the Secretary of the Interior to develop a Report to the Congress detailing the method that will result in "full restoration" of the ecosystem and native anadromous fish of the Elwha River. Previous analyses conducted by agencies including the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, National Park Service, and the General Accounting Office all concluded that full restoration can only be achieved through the removal of the Elwha and Glines Canyon projects. P.L. 102-495 offers a comprehensive solution to a regional problem, avoids protracted litigation of the FERC licensing proceeding as well as associated substantial federal costs, delay and uncertainty, and provides water quality protection for municipal and industrial users. Full restoration of all Elwha River native anadromous fish will result in rehabilitation of the ecosystem of Olympic National Park, meet the federal government's trust responsibility to the Elwha S'Klallam Tribe, and demonstrably contribute to long-term economic recovery of the region. Dam removal will benefit local and regional economies in the short-term from work projects in ecosystem restoration and in the long term from the benefits that result from a healthy, fully functioning ecosystem. Through identification and development of stocks for potential restoration, anadromous fish restoration in the Elwha River will complement similar efforts elsewhere in the region.

Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.

| | |
|---|---|
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 100 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |

| | |
|--|---------------------------------|
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: X NO: | Total Project Score: 300 |
|--|---------------------------------|

Project Costs and Status

| <u>Project Cost Estimate:</u> | | | \$'s | % | <u>Project Funding History:</u> | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ | 0 | 0 | Appropriated to Date: \$ 110,040,000* | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ | 145,846,000 | 100 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 10,098,000 | |
| Total Project Estimate: | | | \$ | 145,846,000* | 100 | Required to Complete Project: \$ 25,708,000 | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | | | | Project Total: \$ 145,846,000 | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | |
| <u>Dates:</u> | | | <u>Sch'd (qtr/yy)</u> | | | <u>Project Data Sheet</u> | |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 3 / 2003 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | |
| Project Complete: | | | 1 / 2021 | | | 1/19/2005 | |
| | | | | | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: | |
| | | | | | | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|----------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|
| Current: | \$ 0 | Projected: | \$ 0 | Net Change: | \$ 0 |
|----------|------|------------|------|-------------|------|

* Pre-FY06 appropriations for this project and total project estimate, above, do not include pre-FY 2000 planning (\$8.2 million), and land acquisition to date (\$29.9 million). With these amounts included, total project estimated cost is \$183,946,000.

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 660 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Relocate West Side Maintenance & Visitor Services | | |
| Project No: 005396 | Unit/Facility Name: Pinnacles National Monument | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 16 | State: CA |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.06 | FCI-Projected: 0.01 | API: 19 |
| Project Description: In accordance with the 1991 Development Concept Plan, this project will remove the existing visitor contact station, trailer, and maintenance facility located in an environmentally sensitive riparian zone and 20-year flood plain site, 2 miles west to a larger, less sensitive west boundary location and rehabilitates the site. Construction at the west entrance of the park includes a new 1,970 (approximate) square-foot visitor contact station, parking for approximately 35 vehicles, and a 3,500 (approximate) square-foot maintenance facility (including search-and-rescue and emergency-medical-service cache), roadway, parking, and utilities (hybrid propane-photovoltaic electric generation, water, and sewage) for the complex. The site development and utilities at the maintenance location will also serve current trailer/employee hookups and programmed future housing. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The existing Chaparral facilities, constructed 1945-1960, are located at the end of a confined narrow canyon, in the 20-year flood plain, and are in full view of the prime Wilderness and recreation areas of the Pinnacles. Existing facilities are obsolete, inadequate for intended purposes and rapidly deteriorating. All buildings have infestations of rodents and insects due to age, marginal construction and deteriorated condition. Maintenance services are in a shed adjacent to the generator. These buildings are seismically un-reinforced. A critical life-safety hazard exists in the event of a major earthquake, wildfire or flood event. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 30 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 30 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 40 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 660 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 2,766,000 60 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 1,844,000 40 Total Project Estimate: \$ 4,794,000 100 | | |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 1 / 2006 Project Complete: 4 / 2006 | | |
| Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 4,794,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 4,794,000 | | |
| Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/2005 | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$210,000 | Projected: \$265,000 | Net Change: \$ 55,000 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 700 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Coastal Watershed Restoration And Enhancement | | |
| Project No: 006556 | Unit/Facility Name: Point Reyes National Seashore | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 06 | State: CA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--------------------------|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.64 | | FCI-Projected: 0.56 | | API: 29 | |
| Project Description: The purpose of this project is to remove or replace nine facilities in various states of repair that impair natural hydrologic process within the Drakes Estero watershed. The project involves treatment at three geomorphic restoration sites and six culvert crossing sites. Work at the geomorphic restoration sites would include removal of roads, culverts, a dam and fill; restoration of tidal marsh; and construction of a long-span bridge to replace visitor beach access. Work at the six culvert crossing sites would include replacement or repair of failed culverts with natural-bottom arched culverts or cement-box culverts and in-channel grade changes to meet federal and state fish passage criteria, reduce stream velocities, and protect floodplain processes at the crossings. General work would include slope and grade restoration on abandoned roads and fill areas, re-routing of trails, and re-vegetation of disturbed areas. | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: This project intends to remove facilities from wilderness and estuarine areas, and replace existing road crossings with structures that allow for natural hydrologic process and fish passage for anadromous salmonids (two federally listed threatened species, coho salmon and steelhead trout) and other aquatic species. The project will restore five coastal watersheds within the park's wilderness area. The objective is to remove and restore physical impediments and correct abandoned roads associated with past land-use practices which are known to pose major ecological threats. These facilities were the centerpiece of coastal development activities that threatened the area in the late 1950s and led directly to the Congressional establishment of the Seashore on September 13, 1962 "to save and preserve, for the purpose of public recreation, benefit, and inspiration, a portion of the diminishing seashore of the United States that remains undeveloped (PL 87-657)." The project includes a number of specific physical treatments within five coastal watersheds, all draining into the Drakes Estero system. This area is recognized as a part of the most intact and ecologically significant estuarine areas in the state of California (State of California, 1983). The restoration will provide for the return of the natural hydrologic regime in the Drakes Estero system and ultimately allow for the reintroduction and enhancement of endangered aquatic populations. The project area lies within the Central California Ecologically Sensitive Unit (ESU) for the federally listed coho salmon and steelhead trout and contains habitat critical to these species' survival. | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | |
| 100 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: | | NO: x | | Total Project Score: 700 | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|----|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 2,160,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 2,160,000 |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$ 2,160,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Project Total: | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | \$ 2,160,000 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |
| Construction Start/Award 1 / 2006 | | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | |
| Project Complete: 3 / 2007 | | | 1/19/2005 | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Current: \$ 5,750 | Projected: \$ 5,250 | Net Change: (\$ 500) |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|

National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 700 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| Project Title: Protect Park Resources by Removing Failing Roads | | |
| Project No: 059730 | Unit/Facility Name: Redwood National Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 01 | State: CA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|----------------|----|--------------------------|----|--|---|---|---|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: | NA | FCI-Projected: | NA | API: | NA | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: This project would remove failing, abandoned logging roads in ecologically sensitive Lost Man Creek watershed, a tributary to Redwood Creek in three phases. Work would include excavating road fill that is currently or potentially landsliding into sensitive stream channels that support valuable aquatic resources and re-establishing topography and the stream channel network that existed prior to road construction. More than 60 miles of large, poorly constructed, logging roads were built within the Lost Man Creek watershed. The park has received funding in the past to remove 29 miles of these roads. This package proposes the removal of 11 additional miles of abandoned and failing roads, primarily in the South Fork of Lost Man Creek, which pose a great threat to park resources. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The Lost Man Creek watershed contains pristine ancient redwood forest, a picnic area, and 17 miles of hiking and bicycling trails. These facilities are easily accessible by vehicles and disabled people, opportunities available nowhere else in Redwood NP. Upstream of these park resources are heavily disturbed harvested timber lands with miles of failing, abandoned logging roads. The roads are eroding, threatening park resources with significant damage from erosion and sedimentation. The removal of roads in Lost Man Creek watershed will greatly reduce the threat of catastrophic impacts of erosion and sedimentation in a prime park stream. Without removing these threats, park resources are at risk of significant damage and loss. Future protection of these resources and the surrounding ecosystem in Lost Man Creek depends upon adequate and timely funding for the removal of failing logging roads. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>100 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | | | | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 100 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | Total Project Score: 700 | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|---|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$10,033,000 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 0 Total Component Estimate: \$10,033,000 100 Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 3,263,000 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 2,169,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 4,601,000 Project Total: \$ 10,033,000 |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 4/2006 Project Complete: 4/2009 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 29,000 | Projected: \$ 0 | Net Change: \$ (29,000) |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 700 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Repair Sala Burton Maritime Museum Building | | |
| Project No: 005585 | Unit/Facility Name: San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 08 | State: CA |

Project Justification

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.17 | | FCI-Projected: 0.02 | API: 30 |
| Project Description: The Sala Burton Building serves as the maritime museum building, conveying through exhibits the seafaring history of the Pacific Coast. This National Historic Landmark structure, a striking example of "art moderne" architecture, was constructed in 1939 by WPA workers. The walls of the magnificent great hall on the first floor have unique murals above the ornate marble terrazzo flooring. The building became a maritime museum in 1950. The waterproof membrane beneath the tile roofs has failed, resulting in numerous water leaks. Over the years the window frames have rusted, breaking the window sealant and glass and allowing rain to enter the concrete structure. A glass block wall has also deteriorated, creating additional leaks. Engineering studies recommend replacing the waterproof membrane on the roofs. In addition, window frames and the glass block wall must be replaced with properly designed fittings of similar appearance. This package will fully correct these building deficiencies. | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Attempts at low-cost solutions have not been effective. Building roofs have been coated with waterproof materials that periodically fail, requiring patching or replacing each year. Windows are re-sealed with poor results. The frequent and unpredictable costs of roof and window repairs have been from \$25,000 to \$60,000. The Regional Office commissioned a study in 1992 entitled "Conditions Investigations and Waterproofing Assessment Report", which found that the building "... is currently threatened by water leaks, seeping in through deteriorated steel window frames and tiled roofs, and threatening the underlying concrete structure." In many areas concrete spalling has occurred causing failure in the concrete walls and ceiling beams. Water intrusion has already damaged murals and historic coatings on ceilings, walls and floors. Stopping the water leaks would assure long-term preservation of an otherwise sound building and would reduce repair costs by approximately \$95,000 a year. This amount is estimated to be the total of park facility management staff time to respond to emergencies, contract expenses for emergency roof and window repairs, loss of energy from leaky windows and park cultural resources staff time and expenses to mitigate water damage to resources. There is also a significant amount of lost effort in the janitorial contract (due to extensive mopping-up events). | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | |
| 100 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: | | NO: x | Total Project Score: 700 |

Project Costs and Status

| <p>Project Cost Estimate:</p> <table> <tr> <th>\$'s</th><th>%</th></tr> <tr> <td>Deferred Maintenance Work :</td><td>\$ 4,350,000 100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Capital Improvement Work:</td><td>\$ 0 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Estimate:</td><td>\$ 4,350,000 100</td></tr> </table> <p>Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06</p> | \$'s | % | Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 4,350,000 100 | Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 0 | Total Project Estimate: | \$ 4,350,000 100 | <p>Project Funding History:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Appropriated to Date:</td><td>\$ 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Requested in FY 2005 Budget:</td><td>\$ 4,350,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Required to Complete Project:</td><td>\$ 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Project Total:</td><td>\$ 4,350,000</td></tr> </table> | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 | Requested in FY 2005 Budget: | \$ 4,350,000 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 | Project Total: | \$ 4,350,000 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|------|----------------|--------------|
| \$'s | % | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 4,350,000 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$ 4,350,000 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Requested in FY 2005 Budget: | \$ 4,350,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Total: | \$ 4,350,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 1 / 2006 Project Complete: 2 / 2006</p> | <p>Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005</p> <p>Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 21,204.00 | Projected: \$ 13,784.00 | Net Change: (\$ 7,420.00) |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|

National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 710 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Resources for Accessibility and Safety | | |
| Project No: 060099 | Unit/Facility Name: Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 06 | State: MA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.32 | FCI-Projected: 0.07 | API: 28 | | | | | | | | |
| Project Description: The purpose of this project at Saugus Iron Works is threefold: <ul style="list-style-type: none">To upgrade visitor contact facilities by rehabilitating and restoring portions of the historic (c. 1680) Iron Works House currently used for offices and storage for use as an accessible visitor interpretive and orientation space, including installation of new exhibits. The existing contact station -- which now blocks visitor views of the Iron Works industrial core -- will be removed.To provide safe universal access to the structures and landscape, while preserving the cultural landscape and protecting archeological resources, by modifying the pathway between the Iron Works House and the industrial area (a 20-foot difference in grade) and installing a ramp and a mechanical stair lift. Safe access will be provided within the industrial area by re-grading, modifying the pathways system, and installing two additional mechanical stair lifts.To ensure protection of park museum collections by consolidating the majority of collections in proper environments located with the curatorial staff. Non-historic houses owned by the park will be remodeled into museum collections storage, curatorial workspace, and office space. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The 17th-century Iron Works House is currently not accessible to persons with disabilities; NPS offices and storage space currently occupy the sections of the house that could provide accessibility. These areas of the house also exhibit significant deterioration of historic fabric. Moving visitor orientation from the contact station (to be removed) into these sections will increase access to this primary resource for both persons with disabilities and the general public (only 8% can currently visit the house). The 20-foot drop between the area of the House and the area of the Iron Works industrial complex currently precludes handicap access to the Iron Works and creates safety hazards for all visitors. Grade changes within the Iron Works complex itself are also needed for accessibility; these changes can be sensitively done, without damaging the integrity of the cultural landscape. Museum collection storage is scattered and vulnerable, and many items are deteriorating rapidly from lack of climate controls; converting a modern park-owned residence can provide space and controls. Office space for staff is severely limited. Offices and museum storage removed from the Iron Works House to make it accessible to the public can be moved into converted park residences. Cost of conversion of the park residences is approximately 10% of the cost of a new collections storage facility. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. <table><tr><td>40 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>30 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 40 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 30 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 40 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 20 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 30 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x | | Total Project Score: 710 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|--|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 1,334,000 % 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 % 0 Total Project Estimate: \$ 1,334,000 % 100 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 1,334,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 1,334,000 |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 2 / 2006 Project Complete: 1 / 2007 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Current: \$ 80,950 | Projected: \$ 86,430 | Net Change: \$ 5,480 |
|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 810 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|-----------|
| Project Title: Restore Saugus River Turning Basin and Dock | | |
| Project No: 060214 | Unit/Facility Name: Saugus Iron Works National Historic Site | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 6 | State: MA |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---------|
| FCI-Before: 1.00 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 33 |
| Project Description: Restore an open-water condition to the head of the Saugus River tidal basin at the park by dredging up to 4 acres to remove dense stands of invasive exotic vegetation and contaminated marsh sediments, which have severely degraded both the cultural landscape and the natural environment of the park. Rehabilitate the unsafe, silted-in and severely deteriorated wooden wharf and bulkhead to restore structural integrity and function to this major historic feature (LCS number 40302). | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The General Management Plan (GMP) recommends this project as fundamental to park cultural and natural stewardship. The Saugus River basin in the park became silted in after a dam breach, north of the park, in 1957; and the river has since been choked by massive growth of phragmites (a tall, perennial grass capable of forming large stands) and other exotic plants in the park, as well as by contaminants from a former factory upstream. The restoration and clean-up of the tidal basin will eliminate threats to human health and safety and will improve natural habitats. Restoration of the historic waterfront/tidal basin is essential to visitor understanding of why the iron works was located in this place, for the transport of raw materials and the shipping of finished iron goods to local and international markets. The rehabilitation of the small historic wharf and the cultural and natural landscape would restore essential historical context. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. 70 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 10 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 20 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 810 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 3,078,000 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 0 Total Component Estimate: \$ 3,078,000 100 Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 3,078,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 3,078,000 |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 2/2006 Project Complete: 4/2006 | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/2005 Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 15,000 | Projected: \$ 5,000 | Net Change: \$ (10,000) |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 640 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate and Remodel Panorama Facility as Visitor/Learning Center | | |
| Project No: 012009 | Unit/Facility Name: Shenandoah National Park | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: 10 | State: VA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|----------------|------|--------------------------|----|--|--|--|---|---|-------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: | 0.22 | FCI-Projected: | 0.00 | API: | 26 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will alter the former concession-owned Panorama Building from its original function as a restaurant and gift shop with concessioner housing in order to strategically centralize visitor programs and park operations in a year-round facility. The existing 12,444-square-foot building will be rehabilitated and a 2-story addition will be constructed to provide the following visitor and administrative facilities: a visitor information/orientation desk, a backcountry permit registration station, space for interpretive exhibits and Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) museum pieces, a multipurpose room on the upper level for an orientation film and school group use during inclement weather, book sales and storage areas for the Shenandoah National Park Association (SNPA), a multi-purpose education/training room on the lower level for public programs and staff training with table workspace and audio-visual capabilities, and offices, work space, and restrooms for SNPA and all of the park staff functions (visitor education, interpretation, law enforcement, fee collection, and backcountry/ wilderness coordinator). Building alterations will include hazardous materials abatement, installation of an elevator and stairway addition for ADA compliance, installation of new energy efficient windows, repairs to the exterior of the building, and demolition and upgrading of utilities and demolition and replacement of interior walls and finishes to accommodate the new uses. The existing water main will be replaced and upgraded to meet code requirements. A separate vehicle-storage building, funded primarily by the Fire Management Program, will be constructed at the site to accommodate search and rescue, emergency medical services, and wildland fire equipment.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: This project will provide a year-round facility for Shenandoah National Park's nearly 1.5 million annual visitors. The Panorama Building is strategically located at the intersection of U.S. Hwy 211 and Skyline Drive and is the only park visitor facility situated on a major cross-mountain highway maintained by the state. Visitors must travel 20 miles from this park entrance before encountering a visitor center that is only open from April through November, with no visitor services currently available from December through March. A year-round visitor/learning center at this second busiest entrance to the park would increase visitor safety, knowledge and enjoyment of park opportunities, and the understanding and appreciation of park natural and cultural resources necessary to discourage negative behaviors that degrade the resources. The exhibits will include historic artifacts and will address interpretive themes that are not covered in other park facilities. The facility will provide for the indoor component of adult education programs, as well as, an orientation and staging area, lunch space, and inclement weather options for school programs. Creation of work space for law enforcement and SNPA staff at this location will allow the park to return housing units currently used as offices to their original purpose of providing seasonal park staff housing and to eliminate two trailers presently used for offices. The consolidation of park staff functions will improve operational efficiency and the location of the facility also makes it ideal for park and NPS meetings, training sessions, and conferences. Local communities and stakeholders will benefit from the increase in family recreational and educational opportunities (especially in the winter months), increased tourism, and improved resource stewardship. In-kind services from the cooperating association equal to operational costs of \$40,000 per year will help support visitor services. Display of CCC-era museum objects will encourage the national Alumni of the CCC to continue their efforts to help the park tell a currently "untold story" and primary park theme of the "building of Shenandoah National Park" by the CCC in the 1930s and 1940s.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>40 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>20 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | | | | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 20 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 40 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 20 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X | | | | Total Project Score: 640 | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ 1,934,000 | 40 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ 2,901,000 | 60 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 4,835,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | | | \$ 4,835,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | | | Project Total: | \$ 4,835,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 1/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental |
| Project Complete: | | | 1/2007 | | 1/21/2005 | Approval: |
| | | | | | YES: | NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Current: | \$ 30,000 | Projected: | \$ 490,000 | Net Change: | \$ 460,000 |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 850 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|----------------------|
| Project Title: Rehabilitate Ellis Island Historic Seawall | | |
| Project No: 016509 | Unit/Facility Name: Statue of Liberty National Monument & Ellis Island | |
| Region: Northeast | Congressional District: NY 08, NJ 13 | State: NY, NJ |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.25 | FCI-Projected: 0.07 | API: 33 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: The purpose of this project is to rehabilitate the historic seawall surrounding Ellis Island's 28-acre land mass. However, not all of the wall's long-term preservation needs can be addressed with the requested funding, so this project employs a combination of different treatment approaches to maximize cost effectiveness. The following scope of work is proposed throughout the seawall except for the west elevation where its protection from primary tidal action, ferry wakes and storm surges has resulted in a much better existing condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Install a cofferdam around the seawall below high tide in order to perform seawall work "in the dry," aggregate clean existing masonry to ensure proper bonding of new work, reset missing or loose stone units and re-point wall, all with grout backfilling as work progresses. To optimize use of the cofferdam, all joints below high tide will be re-pointed; above high tide, only as required.• Taking advantage of the cofferdam, patch cracks in concrete pilings.• Install micro-piles adjacent to or through wall in areas of exposed deteriorated wood foundation.• Install localized soil injection grouting at rear of wall to affect "seal" at areas of acute erosion.• At areas of landside sinkholes, install geo-textile fabric and loose aggregate.• During design development, further assessment of the micro-piles and soil ejection will refine construction materials, methods and quantities as well as the number of sinkholes to be in-filled. | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The Ellis Island seawall is approximately 6,736 linear feet, built in phases using a variety of construction systems from 1913 to 1934. The seawall exhibits varying degrees of deterioration. With the wave-induced erosion of mortar joints, granite blocks have become dislodged and fallen into the harbor. Because of the voids from this missing mortar and stone, harbor water and landside runoff move back and forth through the wall causing further mortar loss, stone displacement, soil erosion and resultant sinkholes. These sinkholes are of particular concern underneath the heavy public-use sidewalks on Island 1 and in front of the Ferry Terminal Building. Cyclic dredging in the ferry slip has exposed sections of the wall's wooden piles and subjected them to marine borer attack and loss of structural integrity. Over time, the results of these dynamics threaten increased seawall and soil loss which in turn will result in increased repair costs and potential loss of historic structures.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>50 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 50 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 50 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 50 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 850</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 8,452,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 8,452,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 8,452,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: | B | | Project Total: | \$ | 8,452,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | 09/30/06 | | | | |
| Dates: | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since | |
| Construction Start/Award | 1/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental Approval: | |
| Project Complete: | 4/2008 | | 1/19/2005 | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|-------------------|------|--------------------|------|
| Current: | \$ 0 | Projected: | \$ 0 | Net Change: | \$ 0 |
|-----------------|------|-------------------|------|--------------------|------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 675 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Preserve Moton Airfield Site | | |
| Project No: 070714 | Unit/Facility Name: Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site | |
| Region: Southeast | Congressional District: 03 | State: AL |

Project Justification

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---------|
| FCI-Before: 0.24 | | FCI-Projected: 0.16 | API: 29 |
| Project Description: This project would provide the initial rehabilitation and facility construction for the Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site at Moton Field in Tuskegee, Alabama, and includes construction of a visitor parking area for cars and buses and pedestrian walkways and trails to provide for visitor access and circulation; preservation and rehabilitation of historic buildings and support structures, the historic entrance gate, historic tarmac, and the historic scene of the World War II era flight training complex including removal of non-historic buildings, erection of "ghost structures" on the site of former historic buildings, as well as architectural and cultural landscape features of the complex; production of interpretive exhibits including historical markers, wayside and museum exhibits; and construction of site facilities including lighting, utilities, and drainage. Preliminary site development and utility work was begun with funding provided in fiscal year 2005. The full cost of this project will not be known until a capital plan and value analyses have been completed. The reviews will examine various options, including the removal of low-priority structures that are in poor conditions and are not essential to understanding the site. | | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Tuskegee Airmen National Historic Site is a new unit of the National Park System. Although visitors are already coming to the site, limited facilities currently exist to serve their needs and access to the historic site is prohibited for visitor safety and resource protection. While emergency stabilization work funded in fiscal year 2002 has been completed on the historic buildings, it provided only a temporary action to stall deterioration. Other historic resources of the site, including the historic entrance gate, tarmac, and cultural landscape, will also continue to deteriorate until preservation and rehabilitation treatment is applied. Preservation and rehabilitation work is needed to protect and preserve historic fabric of these primary park resources. Onsite drainage problems also contribute to deterioration of the site's cultural resources and must be addressed as soon as possible. Without basic visitor facilities, visitors will continue to be unable to access the site and their ability to understand or appreciate the significance of the Tuskegee Airmen will be limited. The buildings and grounds harbor a variety of health and safety hazards. All employees entering the historic structures and complex grounds for necessary work are at potential risk. Without the project, these risks would continue and increase as the buildings and grounds deteriorate. These risks include potential injury due to falling debris, exposure to airborne biohazards from pigeon dung, and fungal growth and hantavirus, and exposure to poisonous snakes and poisonous insects. Buildings are not ADA-accessible, and the existing conditions of these resources range from poor to very poor. Drainage problems and other unsafe conditions will constrain visitor use to building exteriors and limited portions of the site. Completion of this project will substantially eliminate the backlog of deferred maintenance for this site. The restored and rehabilitated structures will be upgraded to meet all health and safety codes required while returning them to their historic appearance and integrity. | | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | | |
| 20 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | |
| 25 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | |
| 45 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | | 10 % Other Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: | | Total Project Score: 675 | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 5,689,450 | 65 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 1,986,000 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 3,063,550 | 35 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 6,767,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 8,753,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ TBD |
| Class of Estimate: | B | | Project Total: | \$ 8,753,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | 09/30/06 | | | |
| Dates: | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | 1/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: | 3/2007 | | 1/20/2005 | YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| Current: | \$ 0 | Projected: | \$ 454,000 | Net Change: | \$ 454,000 |
|-----------------|------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 260 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Construct Northwest Alaska Heritage Center and Administrative Headquarters | | |
| Project No: 016352 | Unit/Facility Name: Western Arctic National Parklands | |
| Region: Alaska | Congressional District: 01 | State: AK |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|--------------------------------|---|--|
| FCI-Before: 1.05 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 29 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will construct a visitor / Native Alaskan heritage center / administration building in Kotzebue, Alaska, that will serve the Western Arctic National Parklands (Bering Land Bridge National Preserve, Kobuk Valley National Park, Cape Krusenstern National Monument, and Noatak National Preserve) and the NANA Regional Corporation (NANA). The facility will include an information lobby / sales area; auditorium; museum; library; science center and labs; curatorial / archival storage and workspace; office space; and rest rooms. The building will in part replace an obsolete, unsafe visitor center. This facility will be built on land to be acquired from NANA and may reuse portions of an existing foundation. This project will also construct a maintenance shop / warehouse (up to 7,000 square feet) and a boat / vehicle storage building (up to 6,000 square feet) on land already owned by the government. If the budget requires, these facilities may be rehabilitated space or smaller new buildings. The project includes utility connections and site improvements. The scope of work continues to evolve due to ongoing negotiations with NANA and the NPS will provide facilities to meet the described functions within the estimated cost, but the final breakdown of programmed spaces may vary. Funding is being accomplished in three phases in order to purchase and ship large materials to the site via barge in late summer 2004 for foundation construction in FY 2005 and building construction in FY 2006. Materials are shipped to this remote area on the Bering Sea via daily cargo jets or by a few summer barges. Arctic construction requires foundation pile placement in permafrost during the winter. If large materials (steel piles, platform and framing materials, etc.) do not arrive on a summer barge, then construction would be delayed for ten months with attendant cost escalation.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: Access to the four Western Arctic park units is limited to the transportation centers of Kotzebue and Nome. The new facilities will facilitate efficient and effective information dispersal and interpretive services since nearly all visitors must travel through these communities and few will have the means to experience the parks firsthand. This project will provide more opportunities for more visitors and will improve community and stakeholder relations. Park staff and functions that are currently scattered among several inadequate facilities will be consolidated. Interest in travel to the parks and visits to NPS facilities in Kotzebue have risen significantly in recent years. Villages and native groups have shown active interest in developing eco-tourism in the area. Increased public contacts by the interpretive division highlight the need for expanded space and an auditorium. Offices are now housed in a leased building and have suffered numerous break-ins. Maintenance activities are located in an old Dairy Queen building partially retrofitted to meet basic maintenance needs but without safe, adequate work areas. Science facilities will provide support for resource management activities on 9 million acres of land.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>15 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>65 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 15 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 65 % Other Capital Improvement | 10 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 15 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 65 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: x NO: | | Total Project Score: 260 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|-----|---------------------------------|---------------|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 2,383,350 | 15 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 3,156,000 | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$13,505,650 | 85 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 12,733,000 | |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$15,889,000 | 100 | Planned Funding: | \$ 0 | |
| Class of Estimate: B | | | Future Funding to | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | Complete Project: | | |
| | | | Project Total: | | |
| Project Data Sheet | | | Unchanged Since | | |
| Prepared/Last Updated: | | | Departmental | | |
| Approval: YES: NO: x | | | | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 279,250 | Projected: \$ 251,540 | Net Change: (\$ 27,710) |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 890 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|
| Project Title: Structural and Utility Rehabilitation for the Executive Residence and President's Park | | |
| Project No: 077009 | Unit/Facility Name: White House | |
| Region: National Capital | Congressional District: AL | State: District of Columbia |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: NA | FCI-Projected: NA | API: NA | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: Construction funds are requested to continue the multi-year effort to address the repair and maintenance backlog at the White House and President's Park. Funding is being used for projects such as the replacement of unsafe sidewalk pavers in East Executive Park; milling and re-paving West Executive Avenue and the South Grounds roadway; waterproofing and repair of the Visitor Entrance Building roof and the Maintenance Building grounds; conservation of deteriorated sandstone columns at the West Colonnade; repair of sewage problems at the Ellipse Visitor Pavilion; repair/replacement of streetlights, park benches, and water fountains; rehabilitating the unsafe grounds electrical systems; replacement of the grounds irrigation system; rehabilitation of the Underground Shop's fire suppression system; replacement of sidewalks; rehabilitation of historic fountains in President's Park; and installation of an irrigation system for the Ellipse.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The White House and President's Park were founded over 200 years ago. As the home and office of the President of the United States, the site is host to more than 1.5 million visitors each year and thousands more who use the surrounding President's Park and its facilities for recreation, relaxation, and First Amendment activities. Electrical systems for the White House grounds that have been in place more than 40 years, and have had many additions and modifications over the years are in need of substantial rehabilitation. Some equipment rated for indoor use is installed in underground vaults that have leaks and when flooded can create seriously hazardous conditions for employees who must maintain these utilities. The vaults are not in compliance with National Electrical Codes and electrical voltage is not adequate to support required electrical service needed in some areas. Since 1985 approximately 165,000 SF of damaged sidewalk paving have been replaced during construction of other projects. This project will complete the final phase of all major sidewalk replacement needed within President's Park. Irrigation systems for the White House grounds installed during the Kennedy and Nixon administrations will be replaced with modern energy and water efficient systems. Presently, no automated timing devices are installed, and operation is dependent upon maintenance personnel. A long-term construction program will allow better advance planning, better scheduling to accommodate on-going site activities and better coordination to take advantage of construction activities by other agencies at the site.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>5 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>15 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 5 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 15 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 5 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x Total Project Score: 890</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|--|--|------------------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ 44,792,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: \$ 29,221,000 | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 6,523,000 | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | | | \$ 44,792,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: \$ 9,048,000 | | |
| Class of Estimate: C | | | | | Project Total: \$ 44,792,000 | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 9/30/06 | | | | | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | | Unchanged Since |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 1/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | | Departmental Approval: |
| Project Complete: | | | 4/2006 | | 1/20/2005 | | YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Current: NA | Projected: NA | Net Change: NA |
|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 970 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Failing Wastewater Treatment Facility | | |
| Project No: 077293 | Unit/Facility Name: Wind Cave National Park | |
| Region: Midwest | Congressional District: 01 | State: SD |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 1.53 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 34 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: The wastewater treatment system serving the Wind Cave National Park visitor center and headquarters area cannot handle current wastewater flow rates and will soon be declared out of compliance by the South Dakota Department of Environmental and Natural Resources (SD DENR). The original proposal, and preferred course of action, for this project would replace the existing treatment system by constructing a pumping station and about 10 miles of force-main pipeline to transmit wastewater from the lower end of the existing collection system to a point near the City of Hot Springs municipal system for treatment. After a contract between the City of Hot Springs and the National Park Service to complete this project was approved, a special referendum was held that voted against the project. The current proposed project is to proceed to construct new, larger evaporation ponds (lagoons) for the existing NPS wastewater treatment system. The ponds will be constructed in a location that does not restrict size, allows for greater evaporation to fully treat wastewater and precipitation, moves them to a location away from the main park road, and will not jeopardize cave resources in the unlikely event of leakage or a spill.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The current wastewater treatment system is comprised of three total containment evaporation ponds. In the past twelve years, the ponds have filled to capacity three times and required that wastewater be discharged out of the ponds by land application. In each case that a discharge was required, the SD DENR granted a "one time" discharge permit. With the latest permit, the SD DENR stated that "future requests for permits will likely be denied" and the park should implement alternative solutions to park wastewater problems. At the current rate of loading, the existing wastewater system will reach maximum capacity in 2007. If a new or alternative wastewater treatment system is not online by then, the existing facility will likely be out of compliance with state and federal environmental protection regulations (40 C.F.R. 125, Clean Water Act of 1972 and 14 SDR 86). Construction of new, larger evaporation ponds in a location that does not restrict their size; that allows for a greater evaporation rate to fully treat wastewater and precipitation; and that will not jeopardize cave resources in the unlikely event of leakage or a spill will also accomplish the project objective of bringing the facility into compliance with applicable regulations.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 90 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Total Project Score: 970</p> | | | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| <p>Project Cost Estimate:</p> <table> <tr> <th>\$'s</th><th>%</th></tr> <tr> <td>Deferred Maintenance Work :</td><td>\$ 4,928,000 100</td></tr> <tr> <td>Capital Improvement Work:</td><td>\$ 0 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Total Project Estimate:</td><td>\$ 4,928,000 100</td></tr> </table> <p>Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06</p> | \$'s | % | Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 4,928,000 100 | Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 0 | Total Project Estimate: | \$ 4,928,000 100 | <p>Project Funding History:</p> <table> <tr> <td>Appropriated to Date:</td><td>\$ 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Requested in FY 2006 Budget:</td><td>\$ 4,928,000</td></tr> <tr> <td>Required to Complete Project:</td><td>\$ 0</td></tr> <tr> <td>Project Total:</td><td>\$ 4,928,000</td></tr> </table> | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 4,928,000 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 | Project Total: | \$ 4,928,000 |
|---|---|---|-----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------|-------------------------|------------------|---|-----------------------|------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|------|----------------|--------------|
| \$'s | % | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 4,928,000 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | \$ 4,928,000 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 4,928,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Total: | \$ 4,928,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy)</p> <p>Construction Start/Award: 2 / 2006</p> <p>Project Complete: 4 / 2007</p> | <p>Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005</p> <p>Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Current: \$ 15,000 | Projected: \$ 24,000 | Net Change: \$ 9,000 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|

National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET

| | |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 880 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|-----------|
| Project Title: Replace Deteriorating Cave Lighting System | | |
| Project No: 092497 | Unit/Facility Name: Wind Cave National Park | |
| Region: Midwest | Congressional District: AL | State: SD |

Project Justification

| | | |
|---|---------------------|---------|
| FCI-Before: 0.86 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 39 |
| Project Description: This project will construct a new lighting system in Wind Cave by removing and replacing the existing 2,400-volt primary power system, transformers, control panels, lighting circuits and fixtures with the new system. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: Most of the existing 2,400-volt primary system was installed in 1955 and after 50 years of use, the system has reached the end of its serviceable life. Because of the high voltage involved, the primary system represents a severe hazard to park visitors and staff in its existing condition. Due to the age of the system and the very high humidity of the cave environment, the insulation covering the primary power conductors has become brittle and easily compromised representing extremely serious shorting hazards. The existing high voltage power lines are routed exposed on the surface, through cave passages sometimes directly adjacent to public trails. The close proximity of the high voltage lines to the public trail routes increases the potential of electrocution. The primary power lines feed six lighting control panels through transformers located along the public trail routes. The transformers reduce the voltage from 2400 volts to 120 volts which is used by the lighting control panels. The transformers located in the cave are an environmental hazard with respect to the natural cave resources. Although it has never occurred in the cave, transformers can explode if they are overloaded due to surges in the primary power lines, such as those caused by lightning strikes. Lightning has blown out sections of the primary power lines, however, narrowly missing striking a visitor on the trail. The existing lighting control panels, secondary voltage lighting circuits and lighting fixtures were installed in 1980 and have now deteriorated to the point they are no longer serviceable. The lighting control equipment is obsolete and replacement parts are no longer available. Lighting control circuits used to black out specific areas so visitors can experience the natural total darkness of the cave malfunction frequently. When this occurs, the lights in the cave do not turn back on, and visitors must be escorted to the nearest lighted trail section. This is also necessary when a blackout occurs as a result from a short in the circuit or other mechanical failure which would occur at an increased frequency because of the daisy-chain configuration. They do not have the opportunity to see special cave features, when the lights go off. Delicate cave formations can be damaged if visitors stumble or fall on them. The cave walls become discolored after absorbing oils from visitor's hands as they reach out to guide their way in the dark. The existing power, control panels, and light fixtures are not properly grounded. This presents an extreme hazard in the moist environment of the cave. There are no protected outlets in the cave so employees using electrical equipment for maintenance or cave restoration work are exposed to electrical shock hazards. There is no primary service disconnect which does not comply with current professional safety standards and this presents a hazard to people maintaining the equipment. The wet environment of the cave poses special problems for the cave lighting system. Water leaks into junction boxes causing wires to short out and melt. The light fixtures corrode and fall apart. The unnatural light and heat energy introduced into Wind Cave by the existing cave lighting system causes moderate to severe algae growth problem in the cave. When the current system was installed in 1978, little was known about the problem of cave algae. Currently to eliminate cave algae resource specialists must wash cave surfaces with a weak solution of bleach and water. This practice is highly undesirable because of the potential to negatively impact other, natural cave biota. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. 100 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 880 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | Project Funding History: | | |
| | \$'s | % | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | \$ 2,851,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ | 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ | 2,851,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | \$ 2,851,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ | 0 |
| Class of Estimate: | B | | Project Total: | \$ | 2,851,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | 09/30/06 | | | | |
| Dates: | Sch'd (qtr/yy) | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged Since | |
| Construction Start/Award | 1/2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Departmental Approval: | |
| Project Complete: | 4/2006 | | 1/20/2005 | YES: NO: X | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|------------|
| Current: | \$ 13,000 | Projected: | \$ 6,000 | Net Change: | \$ (7,000) |
|----------|-----------|------------|----------|-------------|------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 250 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Main Gate Facility at Filene Center | | |
| Project No: 077438 | Unit/Facility Name: Wolf Trap National Park | |
| Region: National Capital | Congressional District: 10 | State: VA |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.08 | FCI-Projected: 0.0 | API: 22 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will replace the functionally obsolete Main Gate structure and three temporary trailers at the Filene Center in order to protect the health and safety of park visitors, volunteers, and employees and to provide enhanced visitor services and security. The Main Gate provides box office/ticketing, theater concessions, and primary restroom facilities for visitors. The temporary trailers serve as office/operational space for usher, U.S. Park Police, ticket services, and interpretive staff. Replacement structures will contain improved visitor use facilities with updated and well-ventilated restrooms; enhanced concession operations; improved facilities for law enforcement; enhanced security and communication features; and adequate office areas with accessible restrooms for employees and volunteers. This project will be constructed from late September to May over two consecutive years.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: Wolf Trap National Park for the Performing Arts is the only national park dedicated solely to performing arts. The Filene Center is a premiere amphitheater with annual attendance of 500,000 patrons at 90-100 summer performances. Members of Congress, other high-ranking government officials, and foreign dignitaries frequently attend. Wolf Trap Foundation officials have supported this project by providing funding to begin conceptual design. The facilities to be replaced are inadequate to meet the needs of park visitors, volunteers, and Foundation and NPS employees, and do not meet current standards. The Main Gate structure is a vital operational facility that accommodates ticket sales, visitor restrooms, and concession activities. It is now too small and functionally obsolete; in poor condition; does support electrical, communication, information technology and security equipment requirements; and does not meet ADA standards. Long lines of patrons outside the box office windows interfere with visitor flow and only one ticket window is accessible. Electrical service is at maximum capacity and inadequate for modern box office technology. Public restrooms do not meet user loading standards resulting in long lines before, during, and after performances and do not comply with ADA standards. Negative comments about inadequate restrooms show up repeatedly in visitor surveys. There are no fire detection or suppression systems and prevailing winds could carry embers to the nearby amphitheater in the event of a fire. Employee workspace is cramped, inefficient and hazardous. Separation of ticket services from the box office requires employees to walk unprotected through the theater plaza with large amounts of cash. The three trailers have been considered "temporary" for over 20 years and have inadequate space for their functions, especially during performance season. Two have no restroom facilities for employees; none have fire suppression systems or meet ADA standards; and all have deteriorated to the point that the cost of repair exceeds their value. The Park Police facility has inadequate space to process suspects or to securely store weapons and evidence, and its physical distance from theater operations slows officer response to incidents. Up to 30 usher employees use two small rooms and up to 120 volunteer ushers check in and out of a 10' x 12' room nightly during the performing season (this is one of the largest NPS volunteer programs, logging 40,970 hours in FY 2002). The second trailer serves as year-round center for Foundation ticket services employees who must walk over 125 yards to the public restrooms in all weather conditions. The third trailer serves as full-time NPS interpretive office and is over 40 years old. A small two-room, log cabin serves as the Ranger Station, the primary visitor contact and EMT facility where seven rangers and fourteen volunteers conduct dispatch and other operations during performances surrounded by visitors, first aid/EMT cases, etc. The building has little storage space for sensitive equipment and an inadequate one-person restroom, and is not special-needs accessible.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>5 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>35 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>60 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 5 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 35 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 60 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 5 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 35 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 60 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: X NO: | | Total Project Score: 250 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ 2,902,000 | 40 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ 4,353,000 | 60 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 4,285,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | | | \$ 7,255,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 2,970,000 |
| Class of Estimate: | | | B | | Project Total: | \$ 7,255,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | | | 09/30/07 | | | |
| Dates: | | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | |
| Construction Start/Award | | | 4/2006 | | Project Data Sheet | Unchanged |
| Project Complete: | | | 3/2008 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Since |
| | | | | | 1/19/2005 | Departmental |
| | | | | | | Approval: YES: |
| | | | | | | NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|----------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| Current: | \$ 3,267,000 | Projected: | \$ 3,277,000 | Net Change: | \$ 10,000 |
|----------|--------------|------------|--------------|-------------|-----------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 925 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|--|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Restore West Wing of Old House at Old Faithful Inn | | |
| Project No: 083977 | Unit/Facility Name: Yellowstone National Park | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: AL | State: WY |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.37 | FCI-Projected: 0.10 | API: 38 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will upgrade utility infrastructure, provide structural stabilization, and improve fire/safety in the West Wing of the Old House at the Old Faithful Inn including Wuthering Heights and Bats' Alley. Original walls will be reinstalled and new walls added to provide compliance with current zone-four seismic requirements. Historically compatible improvements meeting ADA requirements and correcting life/safety deficiencies will be made. Fire systems will be upgraded; improvements will be made to correct fire ratings for the corridors, public spaces and guest rooms. The sprinkler system, electrical and mechanical infrastructures will be upgraded. The West Wing elevator will be replaced. ADA-compliant rooms and restrooms, and areas of refuge will be constructed. The architectural features of the public space and the guestrooms shall not be altered other than to improve the quality of the original historic fabric both on the interior and exterior of the building. The mechanical and electrical systems, including the fire suppression system, shall be buried in the floors and walls to minimize the impact on the architectural character of the building. Original lighting shall be retained but rewired. The antiquated and outdated systems shall be replaced and upgraded to meet current life/safety codes. The building shall be upgraded structurally to meet seismic requirements while still retaining the architectural character of the spaces. The mechanical equipment space in Wuthering Heights will be rehabilitated. Bat's Alley will be rehabilitated to house today's administrative needs. West Wing and kitchen roofs will be replaced. Dormers will be reconstructed upgrading the framing.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The Old Faithful Inn, a National Historic Landmark, is a distinctive example of rustic style architecture. The Inn includes a total of 327 guest rooms with total guest occupancy of 1,044. The Old House has retained most of its original architecture and historical integrity but has deteriorated due to deferred maintenance and the age of its building systems. Substantial rehabilitation and preservation maintenance has occurred at the Old Faithful Inn since 1980, but very little work has been accomplished in the Old House. Since 1904, the building has experienced some of the most severe gravity and lateral loading in the lower 48 states. The building is subject to winter snow loads in excess of 100 psf. The building has also lived through several earthquakes in one of the most active seismic areas in the United States. Electrical, mechanical, fire sprinkler and fire alarm systems in the West Wing are at the end of their useful life and do not meet current fire/life safety requirements. This project will protect the resource, reduce life/safety risks, and rehabilitate or replace deteriorated historic fabric. This work will ensure preservation of this significant cultural resource and reduce the life/safety risks to the overnight guests housed in the Inn.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>0 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: <input type="checkbox"/> | | Total Project Score: 925 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|---------------|----------|--|---|--|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | | | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | | \$ 11,118,000 | 100 | Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 | | | |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | | \$ 0 | 0 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 11,118,000 | | | |
| Total Project Estimate: | | | \$ 11,118,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 | | | |
| Class of Estimate: C | | | | | | Project Total: \$ 11,118,000 | | |
| Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | | | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | | | | | Project Data Sheet | | |
| Construction Start/Award 2 / 2006 | | | | | | Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005 | | |
| Project Complete: 4 / 2007 | | | | | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X | | |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Current: \$ 0 | Projected: \$ 0 | Net Change: \$ 0 |
|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 865 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Madison Wastewater Facilities | | |
| Project No: 019892 | Unit/Facility Name: Yellowstone National Park | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: 00 | State: WY |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.14 | FCI-Projected: 0.05 | API: 34 |
| Project Description: This project would replace the existing seasonal-use, trickling-filter wastewater treatment facility at the Madison Area with a year-round lagoon system that can effectively treat various flow rates at widely divergent ambient temperatures. The capacity is presently estimated to be 150,000 gallons per day. This project would also replace and/or rehabilitate the percolation disposal system to handle all seasons and flows and would provide for storage and/or standby power to prevent overflows during power outages or equipment failure in order to prevent sewage spills into the Madison River. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The existing treatment system was constructed around 1959. The system's original treatment methods and equipment have not worked well with variable seasonal uses and the climate. Modifications were made in 1966, 1974 and 1984 to try to improve the operation of the plant and to meet increasing uses. The equipment is worn out and a major failure is anticipated. The treatment is marginal during the summer season, and the plant is not capable of running from October to May, despite nearly 87,000 people stopping at the Madison warming hut and restroom during the winter season. Raw sewage is stored during this period until the liquids can be manually pumped to the percolation ponds. The solids remain untreated in the holding pond. The system has no backup power or overflow tanks to handle the sewage flow during equipment failure or power outages. Both situations occur and the partially treated sewage runs to a meadow that drains by the campground to the Madison River. Minor failures have resulted in the closure of the campground and picnic area comfort stations. The anticipated major failure would result in the closure of the 300-site concessionaire-operated campground, the picnic area, the museum, and the housing and administrative area that serves these facilities. The winter warming hut and comfort station would also be shut down. Permanent employees would have to be moved to other areas of the park. Major failure would also contaminate the environment and degrade the water quality in the Madison River. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. | | |
| 75 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 15 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 10 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: x | | Total Project Score: 865 |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 4,114,000 100 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 0 0 Total Project Estimate: \$ 4,114,000 100 | | | Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 4,114,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 4,114,000 | | |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 9/30/06 | | | | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/yy) Construction Start/Award 4 / 2006 Project Complete: 4 / 2009 | | | Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/19/05 | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: x |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 72,000 | Projected: \$85,000 | Net Change: \$ 13,000 |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 290 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|--|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Old Faithful Visitor Center | | |
| Project No: 069189 | Unit/Facility Name: Yellowstone National Park | |
| Region: Intermountain | Congressional District: AL | State: WY |

Project Justification

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--|
| FCI-Before: 0.11 | FCI-Projected: 0.00 | API: 21 | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Description: This project will replace the current deficient visitor center with a new, state-of-the-art, visitor education center to provide critical visitor information and orientation services and enhance resource and visitor protection through interpretive exhibits and educational programs. The new center will be 33,300 square feet and will include a lobby with indoor and outdoor orientation areas with interactive kiosks, restrooms, a bookstore, a backcountry permit office, two theaters, indoor and outdoor exhibit areas (including dedicated space in which to exhibit artwork and other objects from the park's museum collection), a classroom for educational programs, a geothermal research library, and administrative space. The facility is being designed to allow for gradual opening and closing of various spaces in order to accommodate seasonal fluctuations in visitation and to reduce operating costs during non-peak periods. The building will be fully accessible, energy efficient, sustainable in design, and built using "green" construction materials and techniques. The estimated total project cost for the new facility is \$27,947,000. Of this amount, the nonprofit Yellowstone Park Foundation is committed to raising \$15 million. The remaining \$12,947,000 is the responsibility of the National Park Service (NPS) and is to be funded through construction planning accounts and this request.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Project Need/Benefit: The current visitor center is substantially outdated; it cannot accommodate existing or anticipated levels of visitation to the area (85% of the park's 3.2 million visitors, i.e., 2.6 million people annually, visit the Old Faithful area); it offers no interpretive exhibits; it is energy inefficient; auditorium seating is grossly inadequate; there is no room for backcountry permit operations; and interior spaces are so tiny that the vast majority of visitors do not receive assistance because they cannot get into the building due to overflow crowd conditions. As a result, visitors currently leave the Old Faithful area confused and without an understanding of the significance of the park or the fact that they are in the midst of the largest concentration of active geysers on Earth. The new visitor center will provide critical visitor services including information and orientation necessary to successfully and safely visit the park and the Upper Geyser Basin (the geyser basin in which Old Faithful Geyser and 200 other active geysers are found), and interpretation and education focused on the rare and outstanding geothermal phenomena of Yellowstone National Park. Currently, there are no exhibits to interpret Yellowstone's geothermal features, which are considered one of Yellowstone's primary/premiere resources and were a significant factor in the park's establishment. Unlike the existing structure, the replacement visitor center will fit gracefully into the historic Old Faithful landscape, and it will reflect the importance and value of its surroundings.</p> | | | | | | | | | | |
| <p>Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need.</p> <table><tr><td>15 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance</td><td>15 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement</td><td>5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance</td><td>65 % Other Capital Improvement</td></tr><tr><td>0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement</td><td></td></tr></table> | | | 15 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 15 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 65 % Other Capital Improvement | 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | |
| 15 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance | 15 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement | 5 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance | 65 % Other Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | | | | | | | | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO: | | Total Project Score: 290 | | | | | | | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------------------|---|
| Project Cost Estimate: | | \$'s | % | Project Funding History: | |
| Deferred Maintenance Work : | | \$ 8,381,000 | 75 | Appropriated to Date: | \$ 0 |
| Capital Improvement Work: | | \$ 2,794,000 | 25 | Requested in FY 2006 Budget: | \$ 11,175,000 |
| Total Component Estimate: | | \$ 11,175,000 | 100 | Required to Complete Project: | \$ 0 |
| Class of Estimate: | | C | | Project Total: | \$ 11,175,000 |
| Estimate Good Until: | | 09/30/06 | | | |
| Dates: | | Sch'd (qtr/fy) | | Project Data Sheet | |
| Construction Start/Award | | 3 / 2006 | | Prepared/Last Updated: | Unchanged Since |
| Project Complete: | | 4 / 2008 | | 1/20/2005 | Departmental Approval: |
| | | | | YES: | NO: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|
| Current: | \$ 336,000 | Projected: | \$ 682,000 | Net Change: | \$ 346,000 |
|-----------------|------------|-------------------|------------|--------------------|------------|

**National Park Service
PROJECT DATA SHEET**

| | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|
| Project Score/Ranking: | 900 |
| Planned Funding FY: | 2006 |
| Funding Source: | Line Item Construction |

Project Identification

| | | |
|---|---|------------------|
| Project Title: Replace Hazardous Gas Disinfection System at El Portal Wastewater Plant | | |
| Project No: 061259 | Unit/Facility Name: Yosemite National Park | |
| Region: Pacific West | Congressional District: 19 | State: CA |

Project Justification

| | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|
| FCI-Before: 0.25 | FCI-Projected: 0.25 | API: 34 |
| Project Description: This project will replace the existing gas chlorine disinfection and sulfur dioxide de-chlorination systems at the El Portal Wastewater Treatment Plant with an ultraviolet disinfection system. The ultraviolet system is much safer and reduces the amount of chemicals required by this 1.0 million gallon per day treatment plant. | | |
| Project Need/Benefit: The gas chlorine is highly corrosive and toxic. Sulfur dioxide gas is also corrosive and potentially toxic. Should it come in contact with water, sulfuric acid is formed. The chlorine tanks are located in the middle of the El Portal maintenance complex and next to state highway 140 along the park entrance, exposing hundreds of people each day to the risks of the corrosive chlorine gas. Additional development of maintenance facilities, public recreational activities and employee housing has occurred near the Wastewater Treatment Facility increasing risks in the event of an accidental release of the hazardous gases of chlorine and sulfur dioxide. Safety and occupational health requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and State regulatory agencies have multiplied making it increasingly difficult to store and handle chlorine and sulfur dioxide. Meeting the Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA) and National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) code requirements for emergency response in the event of an accidental chemical leak is costly and extremely hazardous to the safety and health of Park personnel. The Park has been issued several notices of OSHA violations over the past years pertaining to the disinfection process at the Plant. The El Portal Wastewater Treatment Plants current disinfection system and process is thirty years old and has been replaced within the wastewater industry with safer and more efficient systems and processes like ultraviolet (UV) treatment. The UV systems available to the wastewater industry are both safer to the operator and energy efficient. | | |
| Ranking Categories: Identify the percent of the project that is in the following categories of need. 0 % Critical Health or Safety Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Mission Deferred Maintenance 100 % Critical Health or Safety Capital Improvement 0 % Compliance & Other Deferred Maintenance 0 % Critical Resource Protection Deferred Maintenance 0 % Other Capital Improvement 0 % Critical Resource Protection Capital Improvement | | |
| Capital Asset Planning 300B Analysis Required: YES: NO: X Total Project Score: 900 | | |

Project Costs and Status

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| Project Cost Estimate: \$'s % Deferred Maintenance Work : \$ 0 0 Capital Improvement Work: \$ 2,176,000 100 Total Component Estimate: \$ 2,176,000 100 | | |
| Class of Estimate: B Estimate Good Until: 09/30/06 | | |
| Dates: Sch'd (qtr/fy) Construction Start/Award 1/2006 Project Complete: 4/2006 | | |
| Project Funding History: Appropriated to Date: \$ 0 Requested in FY 2006 Budget: \$ 2,176,000 Required to Complete Project: \$ 0 Project Total: \$ 2,176,000 | | |
| Project Data Sheet Prepared/Last Updated: 1/20/2005 | | Unchanged Since Departmental Approval: YES: NO: X |

Annual Operations Costs

| | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Current: \$ 30,000 | Projected: \$ 80,000 | Net Change: \$ 50,000 |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|